

The DEARBORN *INDEPENDENT*

Vol. 26 No. 19

FEBRUARY 27,

1926

\$1.50 a Year



CHRONICLER OF THE NEGLECTED TRUTH



BRIEFLY TOLD



An ice jam extending from Goat Island to Port Day held back the water from Niagara Falls, making it nearly dry.

Milton S. Bottdorf, Hartsville, Indiana, is one hundred years old and has 117 descendants.

Over 4,500 runaway marriages are contracted every year in Elkton, Maryland, a village of 2,500. The "industry" is estimated to be worth \$100,000 a year to taxicab drivers, "marrying parsons," hotels, restaurants and the county clerk.

New Harmony, Indiana, has just celebrated the centenary of the Robert Owen socialistic colony there. The first infants' school in America is said to have been established in this place. The first woman's club in America was founded there in the Fauntleroy home. The Owen home was for many years the home of the U. S. Geological Survey.



San Antonio had its first big snow in more than thirty years. The people devoted two days to enjoyment of a snow festival.

When anyone starts the Charleston in the auditorium of the Indiana State University, one warning is given, which if not heeded results in the lights being turned off.

Perhaps the longest will on record is that of an English woman which contained 95,940 words and made four large volumes. The shortest will on record was written on the back of a sailor's identity check.

A highway magnet sweeper picked up more than 150 pounds of nails and scrap iron on five miles of road. Another stretch of seven miles yielded 603 pounds of metal. A half-mile of 18-foot pavement yielded 15 pounds of nails and similar matter from the gutter.



Sir Oscar Emanuel Warburg, of the London firm of Warburg & Co., relative of the banker Warburgs of Hamburg and New York, is chairman of the London County Council, which governs Greater London.



In Japan the Japanese cobbler is a carpenter who nails high stilts on to wooden sandals for wet weather and low stilts for dry days.

Many persons still send letters to travelers in the Philippines "in care of the American consul, Manila." Manila, as a part of our possessions, has no more need than Omaha of an American consul.

The college physician at Mississippi A. & M. College says: "I find practically all teeth in good condition whereas nine years ago I seldom found a set of sound teeth."

A neighboring state is spending \$300,000 a year for county agents to educate the farmer in the science of increased production. It is not spending a dollar to educate the consumer either at home or abroad in the use of these products."—F. W. Sargent, president, Northwestern Railroad, speaking in Minneapolis.

A prominent St. Paul attorney, sentenced for contempt, transferred his law offices to the jail and received his clients in his cell.

An American tourist bought an unusual belt of oriental design in a Cairo bazaar and presented it to a New York friend who manufactures women's belt buckles. The manufacturer glanced at the buckle and showed his own trade-mark stamp on it.



The wandering minstrel of the Swiss Alps skis from place to place with his musical instrument strapped to his back.

"I am a strong advocate of restoring the teaching of religion to our public schools, religion of the kind which has been abolished because of purely theological differences not because of its inherent lack of force in education."—Henry Fairfield Osborn, president, American Museum of Natural History.

G. M. Adams, Tyler, Smith County, Texas, produced sixteen bales of fine cotton on five acres and sold it for \$2,484.46; in addition to winning prizes of \$1,500. He declared that he had exploded the theory that one and a half bales were the maximum that could be raised on one acre.

Rabbi Marius Ranson, Temple Beth-El, Albany, New York, urges that the world court be established in Jerusalem. He claims that passages in *Isaiah* and *Micah* forecast such a tribunal there.

The chance of escaping punishment for murder or manslaughter in Kansas City are eight to one; robbery, twenty-eight to one; burglary, fifty to one, according to the Missouri Association for Criminal Justice.


The "Sun Yet Sen University" has been opened in Moscow for the education of Chinese. The students will chiefly study "the theory and practice of revolution."

Unusual floods and heavy frosts have marked large districts in England and France.

The Hudson's Bay Company will operate an ice breaker on Hudson's Bay this year, for the first time in the 250 years' existence of the company, to open up navigation earlier than usual.

Phillips Andover Academy, Massachusetts, has acquired the rocking chair in which the Rev. Samuel Francis Smith sat when, as a student in the theological seminary there, he wrote the words to "America" in half an hour. The chair was once carried to California by a relative.

February 27
1926



The DEARBORN INDEPENDENT

THE ESSENCE OF THIS ISSUE

CONTENTS

When I Began to Know Bryan	2
James Schermerhorn	
"Who Is Governor of Texas?"—Max Bentley	3
Home Craft for Idle Hands—Aaron Hardy Ulm	5
Jewish Rabbi in Jerusalem Writes	
Jesus of Nazareth	6
How the Coolie Cabinet Functions	8
E. B. Johns	
Mr. Ford's Page	9
Editorials	10
Sapiro Officials Run a Sideline	13
"American Audiences Are Fine"	15
W. Teignmouth Shore	
He Guides People Through the Capitol	16
Hynes E. Terry	
Aviation From the Navy's Viewpoint	20
Captain W. S. Pye	

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE DEARBORN PUBLISHING COMPANY
DEARBORN, MICHIGAN
Henry Ford, President; E. G. Liebold, Vice-President and Treasurer;
C. B. Longley, Secretary; W. J. Cameron, Editor.

partial support. The industry (if it can be called that) is now infested by crooks who bilk thousands by means of shady mail order schemes; but the outstanding success of the honest enterprises clearly demonstrates what can be accomplished in a legitimate manner. (p. 5)

The Cabinet is one of the best known, and at the same time least known, official bodies of the nation. In a hazy way we know that its function is to advise the President; but we know little or nothing of the form this advice takes, or its importance, or the many traditions and precedents that are observed at Cabinet meetings. E. B. Johns gives an interesting account of what transpires at the gatherings of the President's official family. (p. 8)

A personally conducted tour of the Capitol. Hynes E. Terry, one of the most popular guides in Washington, takes us to the interesting places in that historic structure—the President's room, the Trumbull pictures, the Rogers' bronze doors, the spot where Brumidi fell while working on the frieze of the rotunda; the chambers of the House and the Senate. (p. 16)

Americans are true lovers of music; they make appreciative audiences; their operatic starts are excellent; some of their younger composers show great promise. This from an Englishman—Sir Henry Wood. Unlike many of his fiction-writing fellow countrymen, the famous orchestra conductor finds much to praise in this country. Delightful reminiscences of his latest visit are set forth. (p. 15)

A hint! The articles on the old-time dances which we are printing each week form a valuable compendium on this alluring phase of American life. Many of our readers not only are learning the dances, but are filing the articles away for their children and their children's children. In this issue we continue the description of the commoner figures in a quadrille. Next week we expect to give a full quadrille with music for dancing. (p. 29)


garding his birth and life. The book is interesting as revealing the new trend of Jewish thought. (p. 6)

Captain Pye's articles on aviation, authoritative and keenly analytical, have been widely quoted and discussed; they have done much to clear away the fog of doubt and distortion surrounding the true facts of America's air defenses. The statements made by Captain Pye may be taken as expressing the Navy's official attitude. In his concluding article he states that the safety and integrity of the United States must always rest upon an efficient Navy, adequately equipped with aircraft. (p. 20)

Development of the home crafts would mean much to this country. It would provide agreeable and profitable work for many housewives; it would help to train the artistic sense of the race; it would give to cripples and semi-invalids a means of

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$1.50 A YEAR in the United States and its dependencies, also Canada, Cuba, Mexico and countries where the United States Domestic Postage Rate applies; other foreign countries, \$2.00 a year. Single copy, ten cents.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS. 1. Notify us at least two weeks in advance. 2. Give both old and new address. 3. Write clearly. Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Post Office at Dearborn, Mich., under the Act of March 3, 1879.



When I Began to Know Bryan

Intimate Friend of the Commoner Tells Just What He Was Like as a Public Man

By

JAMES SCHERMERHORN

"Here is another thing I don't like!"

More than in his first campaign, Bryan made the Bible his textbook, as he inveighed against the imposing of authority on a so-called inferior people. He found no warrant in Christianity "to civilize with dynamite and proselyte with the sword."

"The Gospel to every creature had no Gatling gun attachment. Let it be known that our missionaries are seeking souls instead of sovereignty," he demanded.

The use he made of the story of Naboth's vineyard, during the Ann Arbor meeting, to illustrate national covetousness, has stuck in the memory since that distant day.

I can still hear his exultant full-toned imitation of the cry of the wicked Jezebel, after she had caused the owner of the coveted property to be stoned to death in the streets:

"Naboth is dead, King Ahab! Go and possess yourself of the vineyard!"

Grabbing the Philippines or any other foreign possession was analogous to this infamy, Bryan pointed out to the students.

To be aboard the Bryan special was to sense the hope that sprang eternal in the Democratic breast, as the loyal ones filled the car and the station platform.

"I hereby make application for the post office in this town," confided one of the faithful, as he took the Commoner's hand.

"Well, it is a bit early to begin distributing the offices," said Bryan, "but I will say this much: In the event of my election, I will appoint the best man."

"I thank you very much," said the applicant, going away thoroughly satisfied.

Tumultuous arrivals at every train-stop were so much a part of his life, that it would have been quite understandable if he looked for cheers and bands and welcoming throngs every time the train slowed down for a station, even on non-political journeys. A youthful Indiana citizen, now grown to man's estate, once aroused the great campaigner's ruling passion of getting to the heart of all matters. Bryan's special stopped at this youngster's town. Boylike, he wanted to grasp the big man's hand,

(Continued on page 24)

WHEN they asked Charles Kingsley the secret of his happy life, the author of *Hypatia* answered simply:

"I had a friend."

If you would know the most enriching experience of forty years of newspaper and platform work, let me answer:

"I have been with Bryan!"

Combination of potassium cyanide with zinc in the extraction of gold took the dominant issue of 1896 out of politics.

The blowing up of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor gave the presidential campaign of 1900 its chief point of controversy. With Spain conquered and Cuba free, there arose the question of what to do with the Philippines.

The interval between 1896 and 1900 saw the valiant figure of the free silver fight in a new and strange garb. He had taken off the somber panoply of the platform to don the regiments of colonel of the Third Nebraska Volunteers.

Strange apparition! This believer in the Prince of Peace, this supporter of the pen and voice as against the gleaming sword, transformed into a fighting man by the call to arms of the President whom he had opposed in the campaign.

Bryan was stoutly opposed to any departure from the time-honored policy of holding no subject provinces. The fruits of imperialism, be they bitter or sweet, must be left to the subjects of a monarchy, he maintained.

By 1900, Bryan had become expert in "hippodroming"—the opposition's taunt for his rear-platform appeals

to the people. He had learned how to get out of a shirt, dampened by perspiration, and into a dry one in a trice, and how to snatch, between train stops, the sleep that knits up the raveled sleeve of campaigning.

His gift of speech—the greatest among men of his time—disturbed his foes into derision. He was crowned by them, "Most Noble Grand of the Order of the Open Mouth." They once sought to break up an outdoor meeting by pushing a small portable sawmill into an adjoining lot. The contest was furious for a while but the sawmill surrendered.

No public character ever remained sweeter, more serene under attack. He really seemed to derive satisfaction, if not amusement, from the fierce aspersions of writers and speakers. It may have been his faith—"For so persecuted they the prophets that were before you." It may have been in his fine sense of humor.

Something kept him calm, unembittered, while "The heathen raged, and the people imagined vain things." Few ever saw his face flushed with anger or impatience. There is fun enough in politics, for those who can see it, to furnish an emollient for its acerbities. Bryan's teetotalism was responsible for a roar of laughter from the student body at the University of Michigan, when, about to read from a speech that he was answering, he said, as he reached for a glass of water—

"Here is an extract."

The fun broke out again a little later, as he was paying his respects to imperialism, when he declared with the glass of water in his hand again:



Everybody calls her "Ma Ferguson," but her official name is Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson, Governor of Texas. Her husband, James Ferguson, former governor of Texas appears in the circle.

OF COURSE you want to know—if you aren't a Texan. Every one is asking—except the home folk: "Just who is governor of Texas? Is it Mrs. Miriam Ferguson, elected with a smashing majority in 1924, or is it—as dark rumor runs—her husband, the former governor, James E. Ferguson?"

No courtesy is intended to be conveyed to the office and person of the chief magistrate of Texas in the statement that Mr. Ferguson is he, rather than his wife. Texans understand this peculiar situation if the rest of the country does not. Mr. Ferguson was talking a language understandable to his fellow Texans when he said, during his wife's campaign, "Give Mrs. Ferguson your votes, friends, but I'll be governor. After all, does it make any difference who signs on the dotted line, so long as it is a Ferguson?"

It is true that on January 21, 1925, the day after her inauguration, he said he would merely "carry wood and water for 'Ma' at the Mansion." It is also true that two months later he asserted, "McKinley had his Hanna, Wilson his House, Coolidge his Stearns, and 'Ma' Ferguson has her Jim"; but Texans who have business with the governor necessitating visits to Austin transact

son remains in the governor's private office, signing papers.

There is nothing in this novel allotment of duties to arouse astonishment or chagrin, if you know the background. Texans remember that Mrs. Ferguson frankly admitted her dependence at the outset of her administration. "Recognizing my inexperience in governmental affairs I must ask the advice and counsel of others," ran the inaugural message.

Texas was excited and happy on that memorable occasion, and was in every sense of the word "for" the new governor and her husband. Although Mrs. Ferguson had been only a weapon with which the Texas electorate had satisfied its yearning to "swat the Ku Klux Klan" it was felt that she had done a very splendid and wifely thing in becoming a candidate for an office

"Who Is Governor of Texas?"

Does It Make Any Difference Who Signs on the Dotted Line, So Long as It Is a Ferguson?

By MAX BENTLEY

generally occupied by a man, after the courts had stricken her husband's name from the official ballot on constitutional grounds. Texas, after electing Mrs. Ferguson, heartily wished her well.

But the present state of mind is not so tolerant. To a great many Texans, government so obviously by proxy is becoming distasteful. An editorial in the November 28 issue of the *Austin American* summed up this point of view. It was entitled: "James E. Ferguson Should Cease to be Governor," and ran:

"Mrs. Ferguson should personally not be held accountable for anything done by the Highway Commission. She should not be held accountable for anything done by any department of the government. Perhaps never before has any American state had in the Governor's chair a person who is in truth less responsible for the conduct of the office. The real Governor of Texas is an efficient person—a former Governor who happens to be the husband of the present Governor."

This editorial was a result of the Texas highway fiasco. Of all strange noises emanating from the seat of government this has sounded the dominant, harsh, and all attention-demanding note. Mr. Ferguson's active participation in the sessions of a Highway Commission, consisting of three members, two of whom (appointees of his wife) have lately resigned under fire, has sadly disturbed the state of tolerance with which Texans have heretofore been disposed to accept the dual rule of state affairs.

To understand how fervent has been the "roar," it is necessary to know that Texas has more miles of designated highways than any other state.

Its revenues for highway construction and maintenance—derived from Federal aid, a gasoline tax, and the vehicle license system—amount to about \$20,000,000 yearly.

This is a sum greater than Texas spends for higher education, eleemosynary institutions and judiciary combined.

The highway department directly employs 3,500 persons and 5,000 others

indirectly. It is the most powerful division of the state government; and nearly absolute powers of administration are exercised by three part-time commissioners who are paid, each, the small annual salary of \$2,500.

Consequently, if even a whisper is heard to the effect that administration of the highway fund is not all that it should be, Texas may be expected to rouse itself to an attitude of startled attention.

Such a whisper was heard last July. It came from a newspaper reporter, Silliman Evans, who murmured in the ear of Amon G. Carter, publisher of the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, that he had been informed that certain highway contracts had been let to friends of two of the commissioners—Frank Lanham, chairman, and Joe Burkett—without competitive bidding, without bonds, and at excessively high prices.

The paper went after the situation hammer and tongs, and in a short time the state was in uproar. The attorney-general of Texas launched an investigation resulting in startling disclosures.

It was shown that the American Road Company, a Delaware corporation owned by Texans, with assets at the time of chartering amounting to three second-hand automobiles, an asphalt heating plant and \$15,000 in cash, had been awarded large asphalt topping contracts at 30 cents per yard, whereas 10 cents would have been a reasonable price.

It was revealed that this company had rolled up tremendous profits, and had removed large sums of money from Texas to Missouri banks, besides declaring a \$319,000 cash dividend. The attorney-general forced the return of the removed

funds, to be held in escrow pending the outcome, and brought suit for cancellation of contracts, forfeiture of permit to do business in Texas, and recovery of \$600,000 claimed as excessive profits.

The governor of Texas entered the scene—and in a way disconcerting to her own best friends and those of her husband; for she instructed Chairman Lanham to resent and resist to the end the bringing of the suit by intervening in the name of the Highway Commission, with the assistance of attorneys

paid out of the state treasury. She contended, in defense of her stand, that the attorney-general had no authority to bring suit in the name of the state unless directed by the governor.

The plea of intervention was resisted by the attorney-general and denied by the district judge hearing the suit; singularly enough, the same judge who had, a year earlier, by ruling

to the state treasurer, and bade Texas *au revoir*.

The sequel to the American Road Company suit was the resignation of Commissioners Lanham and Burkett, by telegram and telephone. It was alleged that Burkett had been instrumental in the awarding of large non-competitive non-bond contracts at the 30-cent rate to another concern, composed of certain of his friends. That was the Hoffman Construction Company, at this writing being sued by the state for cancellation of contracts and return of \$350,000 claimed to be excessive profits. The Hoffman company has expressed willingness to follow the American company's exit route, but the attorney-general perversely insists on an airing of the facts.

You enter.

The second door on your right is the door to the governor's reception room. Many others are ahead of you, but the line melts away with businesslike dispatch, and in a few minutes you are ushered into the anteroom of the governor's private office.

A man reclining on a lounge rises to greet you affably. This is Mr. Ferguson, and you like him instinctively. It is true he was impeached while governor in 1917 and either resigned or was removed, according to the point of view, but still he is obviously a personage. He is a commanding-looking figure, tall, with iron-gray hair, melodious of voice and a bit old-fashioned of manner—in every way your conception of the "typical Southern gentleman."

He makes you feel thoroughly at home, and before you realize it has you discussing amenities.

Presently, however, you remember your errand. For brevity's sake you have beforehand written a questionnaire for Mr. Ferguson's perusal.

Mr. Ferguson smiles pleasantly as he receives the typed sheet from you; and very deliberately he begins reading. His expression does not change as he rapidly runs down the list; the suggestion of a slight stiffening which you have noted is only a trick of your own imagination, for as he holds the paper back he is still smiling.

As you pocket your questionnaire—it has not been answered—

Mr. Ferguson says, "Our plans have not matured. We are not ready

to make an announcement yet."

He refers here to the Ferguson candidacy, and adds: "I say 'we' in exactly the same way that a man speaks of the firm for which he is employed as 'we'—if he is a loyal employee." After which he becomes tactfully silent, and you take the hint. As you rise to depart he again shakes your hand with firm cordiality and follows you to the door.

At that moment Mrs. Ferguson emerges from the governor's

private office. If Mr. Ferguson has impressed you as being a person

of intelligence and charm, how much more so his wife! She is dressed

in black satin with a lacy white touch at the neck. Like her husband

she is tall and dignified. It may be that she is not handsome—for

she is a grandmother—but her face is strong and serene. She greets

you courteously and after more amenities you depart—with mixed

feelings: the feeling of satisfaction which one has after meeting attractive people, and a feeling of disappointment at not having had

opportunity to talk with the governor.

But you have.

Moreover, you have shaken the hand of the

governor of Texas—twice. This writer, not being an out-of-stater,

like yourself, but a native Texan, had no doubt on that score when

he took up his hat and departed after his call on the Fergusons.

You want to know whether the largest state of the Union is, or is not, really ruled by a woman. . . . So you come down to Austin. You drop off the train at a rather dinky depot, turn a corner, and are on Congress avenue. At this wide thoroughfare's upper end stands the majestic capitol lording it over the beautiful city of many hills. Gazing on it, you involuntarily exclaim, "What a noble building!" And so it is—in all respects a building befitting Texas' size and greatness. It ought to be, for its construction cost the people \$100,000,000 worth of land. That is to say, the land is worth \$100,000,000 now; but fifty years ago, when the state swapped 3,500,000 acres of the public domain to a Chicago syndicate in return for a capitol, it was adjudged to be worth a dollar an acre. The rise in value is mentioned here to show you what a going concern Texas is.

You enter. The second door on your right is the door to the governor's reception room. Many others are ahead of you, but the line melts away with businesslike dispatch, and in a few minutes you are ushered into the anteroom of the governor's private office.

A man reclining on a lounge rises to greet you affably. This is Mr. Ferguson, and you like him instinctively. It is true he was impeached while governor in 1917 and either resigned or was removed, according to the point of view, but still he is obviously a personage. He is a commanding-looking figure, tall, with iron-gray hair, melodious of voice and a bit old-fashioned of manner—in every way your conception of the "typical Southern gentleman."

He makes you feel thoroughly at home, and before you realize it has you discussing amenities.

Presently, however, you remember your errand. For brevity's sake you have beforehand written a questionnaire for Mr. Ferguson's perusal.

Mr. Ferguson smiles pleasantly as he receives the typed sheet from you; and very deliberately he begins reading. His expression does not change as he rapidly runs down the list; the suggestion of a slight stiffening which you have noted is only a trick of your own imagination, for as he holds the paper back he is still smiling.

As you pocket your questionnaire—it has not been answered—

Mr. Ferguson says, "Our plans have not matured. We are not ready

to make an announcement yet."

He refers here to the Ferguson candidacy, and adds: "I say 'we' in exactly the same way that a man speaks of the firm for which he is employed as 'we'—if he is a loyal employee." After which he becomes tactfully silent, and you take the hint. As you rise to depart he again shakes your hand with firm cordiality and follows you to the door.

At that moment Mrs. Ferguson emerges from the governor's

private office. If Mr. Ferguson has impressed you as being a person

of intelligence and charm, how much more so his wife! She is dressed

in black satin with a lacy white touch at the neck. Like her husband

she is tall and dignified. It may be that she is not handsome—for

she is a grandmother—but her face is strong and serene. She greets

you courteously and after more amenities you depart—with mixed

feelings: the feeling of satisfaction which one has after meeting attractive people, and a feeling of disappointment at not having had

opportunity to talk with the governor.

But you have.

Moreover, you have shaken the hand of the

governor of Texas—twice. This writer, not being an out-of-stater,

like yourself, but a native Texan, had no doubt on that score when

he took up his hat and departed after his call on the Fergusons.

that Mrs. Miriam Ferguson had a statutory right to run for governor, made possible her election.

The ensuing judgment was a complete victory for the state. Officials of the road company admitted to personal friendship with Commissioner Lanham; they admitted the 30-cent charge to be excessive; they agreed to forfeiture of their Texas charter and confessed to judgment for \$600,000, less a credit of \$314,000 representing approved but unpaid estimates on work already done. They paid \$286,000

liquor laws, and not four of them are worth \$5,000. Your governor is thinking very seriously of offering a reward of \$250 for conviction on a liquor charge of every man worth \$5,000 accused of violating the same."

Several months afterward Mrs. Ferguson did offer her reward, raising it to \$500, her proclamation being issued two days before an exchange of letters between herself and Amon G. Carter. It was on July 3 that Mr. Ferguson made his bar association address, the same day on which

(Continued on page 26)

Home Crafts for Idle Hands

Showing How Art and Activity May Be Combined

By AARON HARDY ULM



ACITY lawyer met casually on the street one day a man he had known in another section of the country.

"What are you doing here?" he inquired of the old acquaintance.

"I am my wife's business manager."

This statement so astonished the lawyer that he asked for details. He had known the couple as moderately prosperous and easy-going middle class folk. He had been a corporation executive, she had given herself to homemaking and social activity. The lawyer recalled that a taste for art, expressed chiefly in the adornment of her home and the apparel of her children, had distinguished her slightly from other women of the community.

"You know how her friends used to seek her aid in designing garments for their children," said the husband. "Well, some who were well-to-do began to ask for more than advice; they persuaded her to select goods, design garments, and attend to the making of articles of wear for their children. Of course they paid her. The first thing she knew she had a business on her hands. She carried it on, mostly for pleasure and to accommodate her friends. She found assistants among other women who had spare time from home duties and a knack for fine needlework. These she marketed through a local store and in less than a year's time she was able to make a trip to Europe on her earnings.

How many persons are there in the country who might do similarly?


Letters to me regarding a former article indicate that there are a great many. Most of the writers wanted to know the name and address of the legitimate home work concern, with the view of applying for employment, though it was stated that the concern receives in due course more applications than it can consider.

"I am a shut-in and have no way of making money," says one correspondent.

"I do need to do something to earn money," writes another, a woman evidently who is kept busy most of the time with her household duties.

Another one has tuberculosis but still is able and wants to do something.

All have time, energy or talent which, owing to their various situations, is not being utilized.



Those who are thus situated have grown much in number in recent years. Labor-saving devices and the expansion of bakeries, delicatessens and semi-prepared foods have lessened for thousands of women the drudgeries of housekeeping. Then there are many women who prefer to pay for these drudgeries out of funds earned from work for which they have more taste or talent. As most factories and stores are conducted there is little room in them for the part-time worker. Then there are thousands of cripples and semi-invalids and elderly persons who are shut-ins but might do something, and innumerable children who are denied the best of training—interesting handwork.

There are thousands of others who yearn for some kind of creative work that they can do profitably, at least as a side line in the home.

But they find that the home crafts—never highly developed artistically or commercially in this country—offer them almost no open opportunity, as they do for the people of other lands.

They might amount to much in this country, economically and otherwise, as, most notably, persons moved by instinct for thievery have found and demonstrated.


The commercial exploitation of the room and demand for home crafts—that is, the production in homes of articles calling for craftsmanship—has been left largely to dishonest promoters operating through the mails. In recent years they have evolved a multitude of attractive schemes, some of which have yielded large fortunes to the promoters, a few of whom have landed in prisons. In most cases the schemes are such that (Continued on page 27)





A Jewish Rabbi in Jerusalem Writes Jesus of Nazareth

Author Refutes Jewish Traditions



Review of Much Dis- cussed Book



BUT for a sermon of Stephen S. Wise, New York rabbi, the book *Jesus of Nazareth*, by Rabbi Joseph Klausner, of Jerusalem, might have passed largely unheeded in this country. The book was composed in modern Hebrew and was finished in Palestine in 1922; it was translated in 1924 by Dr. Danby, Resident Canon, St. George's Cathedral Church, Jerusalem, and published by the Macmillan Company, New York, 1925. Dr. Klausner is a Russian Jew who went to Palestine in 1920.

In the sermon by Dr. Wise, as reported in the newspapers shortly after Christmas, occurred two passages, one concerning the superior excellency of Jesus, the other stating that the Jews must "accept Jesus," which Dr. Wise afterward repudiated when called before the Jewish organizations which had been thrown into a tumult by the reports.

The Klausner volume comprises 434 pages with indexes and is divided into eight books. It contains some valuable portions, especially those which deal with the Hebrew, Greek and Latin sources, and those which describe the political, economic, religious and intellectual conditions of the period of Jesus' life. These alone would insure a respect for the work. It wholly destroys the common traditions of the Jews regarding Jesus—those extremely unpleasant legends which have so long been the bane of the Jewish people's thought on this matter—and holds strongly the view that Jesus was legitimately born (as opposed to the numerous and hideous Jewish stories of his illegitimacy), that he was a good man, that he believed himself to be Messiah, and that his teachings have great worth. The book, of course, rejects entirely the possibility of his having been divine in a special sense, or the promised Messiah.

Of principal interest to the Jew will be the result of the critical methods which Dr. Klausner applies to the *Talmud*, *Midrash* and *Tol'doth Yeshu*. In these Jewish works he examines all

the references to Jesus, many of which were written before the Gospels were completed. The contents of these references he has no difficulty in exposing as false. "In the mouths of Jews and heathen opponents of Christianity, these stories were turned into subjects of ridicule: all the noble qualities of Jesus which the disciples had found in him were twisted into defects, and all the miracles attributed to him, into horrible and unseemly marvels." These *Talmud* stories seem as though they are deliberately intended to contradict events recorded in the Gospels: the selfsame facts are perverted into bad and blamable acts." (p. 19) "Specially noticeable is the attitude adopted by the *Tol'doth* to the Gospel accounts. Scarcely ever does it deny anything: it merely changes evil to good and good to evil." (p. 51) "Nothing in the Gospels was denied: it was only perverted into a source of ridicule and blame." (p. 53)

It is impossible in this brief review to give the contents of the reports which Dr. Klausner repudiates, but these passages indicate some of his conclusions. "But can we also seek for historical truth among these *Talmudic* references?" asks Dr. Klausner



and of his terrible death—his crucifixion at the hands of Pilate with, at least, the consent of the principal Jews."

The author's estimate of the Books of the Gospels may be gathered from these quotations: "It therefore follows that the accounts in the first three Gospels are fairly early, and that it is unreasonable to question either the existence of Jesus . . . or his general character as it is depicted in these Gospels." (p. 20) "But to cast wholesale doubt on the historicity of the Synoptic Gospels becomes more impossible the more widely we study all the branches of Judaism during the period of the Second Temple." (p. 126) Of John the Baptist, he says: "There is, therefore, no grounds for suspecting the evangelists of deliberately inventing facts: in the story of Salome alone is there a legendary element." (p. 239) "It can be accepted as a historical fact that Jesus was baptized by John, and also that Jesus, speaking to his disciples after the death of John the Baptist, said of him that he was a prophet and greater even than a prophet, that he was Elijah, the greatest of the prophets, and, therefore, the precursor of the Messiah." (p. 249) These are given as illustrations of the author's acceptance of the historical framework of the Gospels.

This confidence is also extended to various reported instances. For example: Jesus' reference to non-Jews as "dogs" (Mark 7:27) Dr. Klausner accepts as an historical saying "which the Evangelists had no reason to invent." (p. 295) Again on p. 296: "It was certainly then that there escaped from him that sad, heart-rending saying . . . 'The foxes have holes and the birds have nests, but the Son of man hath no place to lay his head.' No saying could be more pathetically apt or more human." He also accepts such sayings as "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God"; and the cry of desolation in the Garden—"Remove this cup from me"—for, says Dr. Klausner, "none would afterward have invented such words, so contradictory to the Christian belief." (p. 332) He adds that "the following words, 'but not what I will, but what thou wilt,' are an addition by the Evangelist, who could not think that a prayer of the Messiah could be refused, or that the Messiah need plead to God like a child appealing to its parents."

The latter sentence illustrates the manner in which Dr. Klausner, while accepting the Gospels in the main as historical, picks and chooses among the contents. Sometimes his reason for rejecting a statement is that it does not appear in Mark. Other times his reason is as in this instance, a view, or motive, which out of his own mind he ascribes to the Evangelist. On the whole it may be said that his reasons for rejection do not stand comparison,

in a scientific sense, with his reasons for acceptance. These lapses in the quality of the reasoning prevent the work from being monumental. The present reviewer, it should be noted, is not criticising Dr. Klausner for rejecting the Christian view, but for the manner in which his reasoning runs below par in doing so. However, what he accepts constitutes a landmark in Jewish criticism of the life of Jesus.

Dr. Klausner, even on the historical side, gives every evidence of having made no use of the mass of constructive criticism produced in the last twenty-five years. His references are largely of the German destructive criticism. This, however,

has the effect of emphasizing the power with which the Gospels themselves forced from him admission of their historical dependability as reports of events and sayings. A mind like that of Dr. Klausner, after reviewing the constructive work of the critics of Britain and the United States, would find many more admissions to make of the invincibility of the Gospel record.

When he turns to the task of accounting for Jesus himself, Dr. Klausner encounters the same problems that all others have met, and is equally unsuccessful in solving them. Jesus' own account of himself is, of course, rejected. It is not contended that Jesus did not account for himself by saying that he was the divine Son of God; it is not even contended that he was an imposter in this; he was honest but deluded, good but misled, wise but inconsistent. This is Dr. Klausner's view.

In this he is entirely consistent: if Jesus' own account of himself is not to be accepted, he must be otherwise explained. And if Dr. Klausner has failed to produce a single impressive line of counter-explanation, he has simply shared the fate of all others who have made the attempt. That Dr. Klausner is himself far from satisfied that a counter-explanation is possible, at least as yet, is indicated in several passages.

To begin with, the author declares that Jesus was not born in Bethlehem


of Judea, but in Nazareth of Galilee. He simply declares it. No reason is given, except the overworked one that Bethlehem was written to harmonize with the Davidic descent of Jesus. Yet, Dr. Klausner insists that Jesus was not of Gentile birth, but a true Jew.

Then the author goes on to discuss the influence of the Nazareth scenery on Jesus—a long passage whose purpose seems more to create an atmosphere than to produce evidence. "There, cut off by mountains from the great world, wrapped up in natural beauty, a beauty tender and peaceful, sorrowful in its peacefulness, surrounded by peasants who tilled the soil, with few necessities of life—there, Jesus could not help being a dreamer, a visionary." (p. 236) This "dreamer" note continues until later when Dr. Klausner feels called upon to take issue with the conception of "gentle Jesus, meek and mild"; then he drops the "dreamer" note and sounds the doer. "Dreamy" is a term which mere writing men use concerning great doers, and great doers of incompetents. Dr. Klausner is a writing man. His description of Jesus as a "dreamer" is unfortunate, but simply illustrates again the impossibility of fitting Jesus' personality into any hand-made description designed by ourselves. In discussing certain acts and attitudes, the author is forced by the facts to abandon the "dreamer" hypothesis. Dr. Klausner (Concluded on page 23)



How the Coolidge Cabinet Functions

By
E. B. JOHNS



DOES a majority rule in the meetings of the Cabinet, and does the President cast the deciding vote in the Cabinet as the Vice-President does in the Senate?" Such the inquiry of a high school pupil who is intent upon acquiring knowledge of the operations of the Federal Government.

There is only one case reported of a vote being taken in the Cabinet. That was when President Johnson was engaged in his bitter controversy with Secretary of War Stanton, which led up to the impeachment of Johnson. The Cabinet never takes any formal action. It decides nothing. In a measure the Cabinet is the President's General Staff with the functions of investigating and advising him in national measures.

In making recommendations to Congress for legislation the President is in no way bound by the views of the members of his Cabinet. He usually accepts the recommendations of his official family in shaping his legislative program. Often, however, a member of the Cabinet will recommend legislation on subjects which come under his jurisdiction without the formal approval of the President, but when the President sends a measure to Congress to which a member of the Cabinet is openly opposed it is time for that member of the official family to resign.

As Cabinet members must be appointed subject to the approval of the Senate, the President usually consults the leaders of his party in Congress in selecting his Cabinet. This is done upon the theory that as Congress often passes legislation which confers executive authority upon members of the Cabinet, it should be consulted regarding their appointment. Such laws are administered under regulations framed by heads of departments. Sometimes the regulations must be approved by the President and other times this is not required. The regulations become law just as much as the original act. Therefore the right was reserved in the Senate to know something of the

Complications Sometimes Arise When It Is a Question of Presidential Prerogative, and Congress May Then Be Asked to Decide

qualifications and character of the men who are to administer the laws passed by Congress.

During the Harding Administration, Congress went further in placing limitations upon the executive departments by passing what is known as the Budget Act. Under the Budget Act the office of Director of the Budget and Controller General were created. Both of these officers have more authority than the members of the Cabinet and on that account President Wilson vetoed the Budget Bill when presented to him for signature, giving as his reason that it was not constitutional. Eminent lawyers without regard to politics believe that President Wilson was right, but as neither Harding nor Coolidge have attempted to have it tested it remains an undecided question.

This is not the only instance in which the President and members of the Cabinet are compelled to ignore the plain technical provisions of the law in order to administer the affairs of Government. As the country grows and the Government becomes more complicated many matters which are by statute and even constitutionally the prerogatives of the President are really handled in the Department. Neither the President nor the members of the Cabinet could find time to carry out all of the legal directions in administering the Government. For instance, the President, under the Constitution, is the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. In theory the Secretary of War cannot dishonorably discharge a private from the regular army. The order discharging an enlisted man reads, "By the direction of the President." In the Post Office Department legally the President appoints postmasters. But enlisted men are discharged from

the Army without any knowledge on the part of the Secretary, not to speak of the President, and thousands of postmasters are appointed without knowledge of the Postmaster-General or even the Assistant Postmaster-General.

In a larger way the Cabinet enters into the affairs of an Administration. In the most successful Administrations the Cabinet or a group of its members have had much to do with the shaping of the policies of the Chief Executive. This has often been carried to an extent that a dominating member of the Cabinet has been charged with really being the President. In other cases the claim has been made that the controlling force of an administration has been transferred to a "Kitchen Cabinet," composed of a group of unofficial advisers. Much was made of the influence of President Roosevelt's "Lawn Tennis Cabinet." There was a popular belief that President Roosevelt made many of his important decisions while playing lawn tennis with Gifford Pinchot, Harry Garfield, and a group of his friends.

These assumptions, however, are not borne out by Colonel Roosevelt's writings. He gives much credit to Secretary of State Root, his secretary, William Loeb, Jr., and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. No small influence in the Roosevelt Administration was General Leonard Wood. The close relations formed between President Roosevelt when he was a Lieutenant Colonel of the Rough Riders, and General Wood was Colonel, continued until his death. If Colonel Roosevelt had been alive there is not much doubt that he would have forced the nomination of Leonard Wood in the Republican convention of 1920. It was notable that all of the Roosevelt family was extremely active in forwarding the support of General Wood in that convention.

The troubles in every Administration start in the Cabinet. Leaders of the party are appointed to the Cabinet, generally on account of the faction which they repre-

(Continued on page 31)

MR. FORD'S PAGE

THERE is no lack of ideas in the world. The air is as full of them as it is full of jazz during broadcasting hours. A glance over society, or even over half a dozen newspapers and magazines, gives the impression that men's mental motors are not only running, but racing. There is great expression of energy, but the feeling grows that it is not properly harnessed, not wisely applied. Energy is good only as it flows into channels of use.

We tell young people only half the truth when we say that they must have ideas. And perhaps it is the more dangerous half, unless it leads to the other part of the truth that ideas have varying values. Some of them are worse than worthless, others that are good have no survival value unless given body and justification in some form of service.

These statements relate principally, of course, to ideas as they play their part in life's practical success. What we see in the practical world today is embodied ideas. Some of them are very old, so old that we have no knowledge of their beginning—ideas such as baking, weaving and the like. Others are traceable to the very men with whom they originated in human thinking. We have confidence that there are others still to come, and we like to think that great as the disclosure of natural secrets and the development of new processes have been in the last quarter-century, there are among our young men the bearers of still greater good for mankind. All things begin in the idea.

Every man of affairs knows how many fantastic proposals there are in the world, whose originators form a tragic group because they have left out the practical element. It is not too much to say that most of the strange things proposed could be actually accomplished—at least once—but the result would be merely a curiosity and not a new service.

There are three cardinal points by which a young man should test his ideas before he loads all his hopes upon them.

The first is the *need* of what he proposes. Contrary to what is sometimes said, we do not create needs for people; we only fill them. The people are not always conscious of what they need, but they become so the moment they see the fulfillment. The true servant of the people sees their need and has an idea how it may be met. He is just a little more clear-visioned than they. The people are mercifully unconscious of a good many things that they need until the servant comes who can give it to them. In social matters it is usually the idea

itself that stirs up the discontent that in time remedies the deficiency. But in practical affairs, the new method, process or instrument that is to make life more efficient simply appears on the scene and takes its place in the list of useful things—and the people wonder how they ever got along without it. That, then, is one test: does your idea fulfill a need?

And is it *practical*? There are a hundred ways of doing any one thing, but there is one simple and direct way which once found will become universal. The whole tendency of life, whatever may

be said to the contrary, is toward simplification. We are doing everything in the simplest possible way. That means, we are becoming more practical. Practical simply means capable of being practiced. The thing which in idea seems simple, but in practice is really clumsy, is immediately ruled out. Men are sometimes so enamored of their own fantastic inventions that they entirely lose sight of the user's point of view. That is the point of view which will keep a man practical.

The next point of test is the *commercial*. Many an inventive man has rigged up things for himself that he could never dispose of in quantity to the public. Yet there is no possible doubt that public service on the scale required today cannot be given except by commercially available commodities. A thing is commercial when it is fit to enter the channels of commerce, and commerce

simply means people getting together with the goods they have for each other's use. Commerce is the extension of use. Much as it has been vitiated by the less lovely elements of human nature, it nevertheless has a great and constant corrective in the Principle of Use upon which, after all, commerce must rest. The pin is a useful article, but it was not useful to the world until it was made in the thousands of millions—until, as we say, it was commercialized. To "commercialize" anything has come to have a degraded meaning, and yet everything is commercialized, because everything is at last paid for by commerce. The commercial test of ideas is one that we cannot escape, and the true and useful idea is never hindered by it. The only idea that has trouble with the commercial test is the idea that meets no need, or is not practically developed.

These are a few guideposts which years of observation have suggested as useful to young people who are trying to learn as much about life's successes as can be learned from the outside.

"Ford Ideals," 452 pages, cloth bound, contains 98 of these articles. Postpaid \$1.00.

EDITORIALS

What Is the Neglected Truth?

SOME magazines frankly state that advertising is their reason for existence—the reading matter is the bait for readers, but circulation for advertisers is the ultimate value they have to sell. Some magazines exist to entertain. Still others were created to afford outlets for certain specialized forms of literature, as poetry, high-grade fiction and philosophy. Many publications serve as bulletins for societies, causes or trades. Some magazines serve the home, others the leisure hour in travel, while others serve chosen lines of propaganda.

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT has long announced its purpose to be "Chronicler of the Neglected Truth."

What is the neglected truth? The forms of truth which are neglected by the publishing world are numerous.

There is the truth neglected because it makes demand upon the mental powers of readers. A curious doctrine exists that the people refuse to think. Only the most elementary mental food must be given them, and that predigested and highly spiced. Unless truth can be adulterated and sensationalized, it is held unfit for publication. Thus we have the strange situation of trivial nonsense being decked out with every trapping of importance while important truth is avoided altogether.

Truth is neglected when it is unpleasant. The doctrine of "don't knock; boost" is excellent in all respects except its application. Neglect of truth leaves only doubtful things to be boosted. Refusal to put aside the unworthy elements in American life, renders them the only things remaining to be boosted. Neglect of necessary but unpalatable truth destroys the faculty of discrimination and falsifies the sense of judgment. The country needs strong doses of purging truth, that there may remain only those elements worthy of being boosted.

Truth is neglected when it runs counter to powerful selfishness entrenched in business, politics or social tendencies. Time was in this country when principle was reckoned bigger and stronger than any violation of it, and Truth was held as an invincible force. But the bad habit now obtains of granting squatter rights to any selfish or subversive program simply because it happens to exist and spreads itself like a green bay tree. Truth sometimes appears like a little David battling a giant

Goliath, and puny hearts hold themselves prudently aloof for the event of having to congratulate Goliath upon a possible victory.

Truth is neglected when it is new. Truth is one and eternal, but the development of human experience with its inevitable errors requires new and larger aspects of truth to guide and interpret it. All our new problems spring from old evils. New aspects of truth are the antidote. Yet though they press upon us from every side, new glints of truth are hardly welcome because they force men to enlarge the field of their vision and readjust their mental make-up. Only by great help is new truth enabled to make its way to the minds that most need it.

The demanding truth, the unpleasant truth, the truth that challenges selfishness, the new truth, these are elements of the Neglected Truth which needs spokesmen today.

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT is free to serve the truth in all its neglected aspects. It puts up no protective lightning rods over any abuse, however powerful or apparently well settled. It avoids the base disservice of confirming indolent minds in their shameful ease. It does not shrink from the unpleasant but curative surgical duty of laying bare the sources of national infection to the light of day. It primarily believes in the curative power of the light. And if it be the light which we let in, its own radioactivity will confirm and justify it.

Much that could be classified as Neglected Truth when THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT began its course seven years ago, is now not so much neglected. Whether due to the efforts of this magazine or to the pressure of events themselves, is not for us to say, but many things which were passed in silence or in fear seven years ago are today feeling the anti-septic effects of widespread public attention. The forerunner in the work of opening up the festering sores to the healing virtues of the light, had to run the gauntlet of much dishonest misrepresentation and much honest misunderstanding. The surgeon with his sharp incisiveness and his relentless harrying forth of hidden evil is a pain-maker in his immediate efforts but a health-maker in the long lasting effects of his skillful work. It is so with those who undertake surgical work upon the social body, the thought body of the nation.

It is only the results achieved that show whether the work was urgently needed, wisely conceived and properly executed.

This magazine is now well past the period of misrepresentation and misunderstanding and the value of its work grows increasingly apparent. We have now entered well within the period of general approbation. But that does not influence us to rest upon our oars. Cowardice has not yet been replaced by courage in public places, nor has selfishness given place to service. The rights of the plain man are not recognized as they ought to be. The purpose of our national life is still obscured by false policies. So that there is still much work to do, more work than we saw at first. It may be said that we have only cleared a little space in which to begin.

Wise Statesmen?

"**H**OW tall was Alexander, pa, that people call him great?"

The above line, from an old-time school reader, must recur to many when considering the claims to greatness of some of the statesmen in Congress—especially since the Donnybrook affair in which Senator Reed, of Pennsylvania, defending his party and business colleague, Andrew W. Mellon, from attack, brought his shillalah down full on the poll of his friend.

In its investigation of the Treasury Department, the Couzens committee reported the three Pittsburgh financial institutions in which Secretary Mellon is interested had been ruled as distinct corporations, and might make separate reports for taxation purposes; whereas, in similar cases, the law adjudges such combinations as one organization, which under a consolidated report is liable to a larger tax than non-affiliated.

In his attack, Senator Norris crossed his lines and charged the saving came through a consolidated report the Pittsburgh institutions had been permitted to make. That is, he reversed the facts.

Senator Reed then proceeded to rake Senator Norris over the coals by proving that in all such cases there was no other legal status for affiliated National, State and Trust banks, than to consider them as combined institutions. He knew, because he also was a director in each and had been consulted in the matter. This is precisely what Senator Couzens had claimed, but what Mr. Mellon's Treasury Department had denied. It was a curious crossing of wires, but it brought out the truth.


But the erroneous decision is made and the case is closed because the executive action of the Department leaves the government no recourse.

There Will Be No Change

IT IS not the Senate that will deal with the Prohibition law—the Senate which lately mistook the mechanical rattle of organized propaganda for the Voice of the People—but the whole Congress, which is a more accustomed listener to the national thought. By that token it may be predicted that this "Gettysburg year," when it is hoped the prohibition law may be tampered with, will prove a final defeat for the "wets." They have every great newspaper in the land. They have a large religious backing among two influential denominations. They have many secret sympathizers among legislators and politicians of all degrees. Government officials, in high place, are known to be nominally "dry" only in obedience to the superior force of public opinion. But for all that, the United States will remain as it is with respect to the no-liquor law. Not a jot or tittle will be changed now or ever at the behest of the "wets." The only point that seems to be unsettled is the mind of the "wets," and that will be settled for all time once they challenge national opinion by attempting to change the law. The only change the country asks with reference to the dry law is a change toward greater effort in its enforcement.

The Couzens Investigation

PUBLIC attention will be well repaid by Senator Couzens' report of his committee's investigation of the tax situation in the Treasury Department. Chaos reigns there, which can hardly have escaped being used as a cover for some highly questionable activities. The plain citizen is warned against the common misunderstanding that Senator Couzens entered upon his investigation because his own tax was the subject of Treasury Department inquisition. This is the exact contrary of the fact. Senator Couzen's personal tax was never questioned until he turned the spotlight on the Treasury Department. Regard it as punitive retaliation, or what you will, the fact is that the Senator's act came first, without reference to his own affairs. It is not unknown in Washington that official power is used in retaliation or to frighten away honest investigators. Not so very long ago, when a United States Senator opened up the as yet unfathomed criminality of the bandits who infested President Harding's administration, that Senator was thrown with an indictment by the Department of Justice—at that time the Department of amazing injustice. The Senator was cleared, but the old game of binding and gagging honest questioners has by no means ceased.



Chats with Office Callers

Said the Movie Man from New York: "The Lincoln film, to whose success so many of us looked, was a failure—as perhaps you have heard? No? Well, it was. And the reason was this: it is always a mistake to offer an American film in so un-American a city as New York. The words 'New York Success' mean that an attraction has made a successful appeal to the un-American mind. Only the alien thing gets by in New York today. The time is not far distant when the words 'New York Success' will damn any play or picture. The Lincoln film came in and failed, as I say. Some of us thought it was a burning shame. Will Hays, who is called the 'czar' of the movies, decided to give it a chance. So through his efforts the film was taken up and sent through American communities, where I understand it is being received as it deserves."

"You are perfectly all right in saying that the Jews own the movie industry, but I think I can tell you that the statement must be somewhat qualified. They own the physical effects, but they don't control as they used to. Kuhn, Loeb & Co. is doubtless the chief financier of the movies. But if you look down the line at the names of the men who control the actual business of production and distribution, you will see that they are not Jewish. And, of course, our Semitic friends have been forced to listen to some plain talk by Will Hays. One of the worst remaining features of the movies is the unchallenged ridicule of religion, especially as connected with the Protestant churches. Almost never is a Protestant clergyman presented as other than a sniveling hypocrite. The Catholics stopped sacrilegious misrepresentations of anything pertaining to their form of faith, even to the situations in which the habits of priests or sisters were worn. And, of course, the Jews have never been ridiculed. But the Protestant still receives mistreatment. He appears to be the only one who is not organized in a way that the movies respect."

The Editor of a Newspaper paid a visit to The Office. He is able to discuss large exciting things in large calm phrases, and spoke serenely of "the present disintegration of the American family."

The phrase I had heard before, though not from a person of first-class intelligence like the Editor. So I asked in sympathetic tones:

"When did your family disintegrate?"

"Oh!" he replied, quickly. "Mine hasn't done so!"

"Nor mine," I said. "And both our families have been here a long time. Two typical American houses ought to be showing typical disintegration by this time, if there is such a thing as a general decay. Really, I would feel un-American, out of

step with our own stock—but the other American families I happen to be acquainted with are fully as sound as our own. Do you know any American families that have disintegrated?"

"I hadn't thought—I don't," he replied.

"Mayflower descendants, Sons of the Revolution, children and grandchildren of Irish and German pioneers seem to me to be holding their own," I remarked. "They are holding their own, too, against forces of disintegration, literature and propaganda of degeneration, attacking every stage of our typically American life from the cradle to the grave. They have done some damage to individuals and families not rooted in Americanism, and even more damage in other countries. But when you see what you can actually call disintegration extending through typical and genuine American families I wish you'd let me know."

In large calm phrases he promised to do so, and we talked of Polar exploration.

Traveling through the United States **the Man from Poland** came to Dearborn and told us something of his people. "The Poles who do well in the United States would be only poor peasants in Poland; there is no way for them to rise there. Business is entirely out of the hands of Poles and is completely controlled by Jews. This has been true for so many centuries that the Pole has not had the opportunity at home to become a business man. The peasant on Polish estates receives six cents a day in summer and 20 cents in winter. The per capita circulation in the nation of Poland is one dollar and a half. We have a population of 30,000,000, of which 5,000,000 are Jews. The latter are given full representation in the government. We have taken a policy of reducing the liquor establishments to a certain small number in a county—not more than two or three, and of course we meet great opposition from the business classes. Our people are hard workers, beginning as early as four o'clock in the morning and continuing until long after dark. When the international financiers refused us loans, because of the reports circulated that we were abusing the Jews (how could we since they have the business?) the people gave up all the gold they had, heirlooms, keepsakes, personal jewels, and we raised \$35,000,000 by that means. Yet I dare say the world heard nothing of it. The only gold that Poland now has is in the muscle of her peasants. We made a loan in America; the bonus was 35 per cent, with heavy interest. The Pole is a hard-working Christian man who follows charity with his neighbors to a greater extent than in most places. And we are looking to America as to a star of hope. We want Americans to understand us and our problems. In one of our cities, out of 12,000

high school students, 8,000 elected to study the English language, while only 200 elected German. That is an indication of the desire of our younger generation to get in touch with American thought and the American method of organizing industry."

We see an occasional real-to-goodness general in the office, but there is only **one General Coxey**, and he dropped in the other day. It is over thirty years since he "marched on Washington" with "Coxey's Army" and was arrested for walking on the grass of the Capitol. Men who were in Washington that day said that real fear existed; but there was no need of it; the "army" was not armed; the only weapon Coxey had was an idea. Many of the hobos that made up the "army" have since attained to high positions. I know a judge who "marched with Coxey," and an author, and an editor, and several business men. General Coxey is an honest man whose life has been devoted to an idea. It is an idea that will some day be realized in some form—there is no doubt of that.

The idea that the General is a visionary disappears on five minutes' acquaintance. He is, it is true, the apostle of an idea, but it is a reasonable one. And he has not profited by it; quite the reverse, he has put his profits into it. He is not one of those reformers who live by taking up collections or by contributions. All his life he has made his own living, and is still in business. On several occasions, when an extra insistent campaign was to be indulged in, friends have helped him with expenses. But he has mostly paid his own. He spent months in Washington trying to educate Congress. He has driven as far as 20,000 miles a year in his little car, attending to his business daytime, and talking his ideas nights. Seldom does he pass a country schoolhouse that he does not go in and speak to the children about the great idea.

General Coxey believes—and he is right—that our money system needs a complete overhauling and that our interest system, if left to run along, will swallow up the world. There is no possible doubt on these propositions. The General's "March on Washington" was a device to make the people think. "They will be thinking during the six weeks it takes us to walk there"—that was his program. But though sensationalism died down and public interest dwindled, Coxey kept announcing his truth. One night at midnight he was just finishing an address on how the people could remedy these matters by issuing currency on real wealth.

"But how can we do it?" asked a spectator.

"The way they do it," said Coxey pointing to a bank across the street. He is not against banking; he is against the privileges of banking as a private monopoly.

Sapiro Officials Run a Sideline

Tobacco Crops Redried in Plants in Which They Are Financially Interested

WHEN the Sapiro tobacco co-operative associations asked for an investigation of the tobacco companies which, it was claimed, refused to buy from the co-operative associations, the Federal Trade Commission discovered that the opposite was the case—the co-operatives would not sell to the tobacco companies. This was not the action of the membership but of the officiary. The reason for their action is found in the fact that a private and profitable business arrangement had been thrust in between the tobacco farmers and the tobacco companies. This business arrangement was devised by officials of the co-operatives themselves.

The Federal Trade Commission has made public its findings in this respect. One of the tables was printed in this paper last week; this week we give another and larger table showing at least 27 high-salaried officials in a private and profitable business made possible by shunting co-operative business in their own direction.

When trouble began to develop in the tobacco co-operatives, a special committee of local agricultural officials and farm journal editors was asked to

look into affairs with a view to reassuring the membership. Lenient as the committee was, it could not avoid seeing how irregular the situation was. It therefore said:

The officers of the association who engaged in this redrying business have come in for considerable criticism. The board of directors has also been criticized for permitting officers who were already receiving salaries to engage in redrying the tobacco for the association. From its investigations the committee believes that the association saved its members at least 25 cents per hundred pounds in redrying costs on the 1923 crop, and perhaps 50 cents per hundred in redrying costs on a part of the 1924 crop. The association got a large part of its tobacco redried at a cost of \$1.75 per hundred in 1923, due to the fact that redriers came to this basic price. During 1924 the Edmondson Tobacco Co. further reduced its charges for redrying to \$1.50 per hundred pounds.

The committee believes that the Board should have announced this redrying policy at the time it was adopted and should have given to the membership a complete statement of the reasons for adopting the policy. Had this information been given full publicity, we believe that much of the criticism which has developed would never have arisen.

The Federal Trade Commission comments:

The statement of the investigating committee quoted above shows that the apprehension of the members of the Association with respect to its officials being financially interested in redrying plants was a cause of defection in the membership.

"The next question which arose was, Who authorized officials of the associations to engage in private business with the associations?" This led to a very interesting series of discoveries: first, that the official authorization could not be found in the minutes; second, when the authorization was entered upon the records, after a lapse of two years, and at a meeting attended by Aaron Sapiro, it was still without the approval of the membership, to whom it had not been submitted.

To continue with the Commission's report on these matters:

It has already been shown that many of the concerns in which officials were financially interested redried tobacco for the association in 1922. There is no evidence in the files of the association that such acts were approved by the membership or by the board of directors or the executive committee. First mention of the subject is noted in the minutes of the executive committee dated June 9, 1923, in the following:

Concerns engaged in redrying tobacco for the Tobacco Growers' Co-operative Association, 1922-1924, and in which association officials or employees were financially interested

Name of company	Cooperative tobacco sent to redriers			Association official	Connection with private redrying company	Position with association	Association salary		
	1922	1923	1924				1922	1923	1924
Edmondson Tobacco Co., South Boston, Va., and Chatham, Va.	Pounds 12,621,312	Pounds 26,543,873	Pounds 17,988,513	F. R. Edmondson R. R. Patterson T. C. Watkins	One-third owner do do	Warehouseman General manager Head warehouse department and director	\$6,000 30,000 18,000	30,000 18,000	\$24,000 14,400
South Boston Tobacco Co., South Boston, Va.	2,174,560	5,865,726	6,572,590	T. E. Hodges F. D. De Jarnett F. D. Williams	One-half owner do do	Grader Grader and wrhsmn. Head of Virginia dark-leaf department	7,000 5,000 40,000	7,000 5,000 40,000	7,500
F. D. Williams Co., Richmond, Va.	4,391,590	2,534,620				Assistant sales mgr.	7,500	9,000	9,000
Richmond Leaf Tobacco Co., Richmond, Va.			2,532,200	F. T. West W. S. Garrett C. C. Dixon	2/4 interest 2/4 interest Director	Grader and wrhsmn. Head of Virginia dark-leaf department	10,000 5,000	10,000 5,000	10,000
Dixon-Buchan Co., Mullins, S.C.	854,168	2,949,616	1,726,555	J. H. Dixon J. S. Neal W. K. McIntosh S. M. Glenn E. C. Epps D. L. Tugge	Vice president Secretary President Stockholder do do	Warehouseman Part owner Grader Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman	4,000 3,600 6,000	5,700 3,600 6,000	6,000
Independent Redrying Co., Kingstree, S.C.	1,291,047	2,357,686	1,528,440	L. N. Ligon J. S. Harvey C. L. Smith A. V. Bobbitt R. M. Winn T. J. Powell E. L. Walton C. L. Smith S. M. Glenn S. M. Glenn V. B. Shulburne S. B. Baughman J. N. Gorman	20 per cent owner do do do do do do do do do do do do do	District warehouseman District warehouseman District warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman Part owner Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman Warehouseman	3,900 4,000 8,000 8,000 8,000 3,200 4,800 8,000 8,500 8,000 6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000	3,000 3,600 7,500 4,000 9,000 7,500 9,000 4,000 8,000 9,000 6,000 6,000 6,000 6,000	3,000 3,600 7,500
R. W. Tugge & Son, Blackstone, Va.	541,799	1,536,638	1,896,702			Salesman dark-leaf department	7,000	9,000	12,000
Pamplin Tobacco Co., Va.	142,019	195,310	611,972	L. N. Ligon	One-half owner	Grader	2,400	3,000	3,000
Harvey, Roxboro, N.C.	94,016	1,095,864	676,904	J. S. Harvey	do	Sole Owner	4,000	4,000	4,000
H. R. Rogers & Co., Goldsboro, N.C.			670,585	C. L. Smith	45 per cent owner	do	8,500	8,500	7,500
Winn-Smith, Marion, S.C.	402,052	1,406,738	811,148	A. V. Bobbitt	do	Part owner	8,000	8,000	8,000
Boyd & Co., South Hill, Va.	535,465	1,297,684	1,421,052	R. M. Winn	do	Stockholder	4,000	4,800	4,000
Noell & Son, Danville, Va.			423,903	T. J. Powell	Bonus agreement	Warehouseman	8,000	8,000	9,000
Reidsville Tobacco Co., Reidsville, N.C.				E. L. Walton	20 per cent owner	District warehouseman	8,500	8,500	7,500
Raleigh Tobacco Co., Raleigh, N.C.			1,302,352	C. L. Smith	do	Grader	6,000	6,000	6,000
Carolina Redrying Co., Washington, N.C.	764,602		1,047,164	S. M. Glenn	40 per cent owner	Warehouseman	3,600	3,600	3,600
J. N. Gorman & Son, Greenville, N.C.	818,276			W. K. McIntosh	do	Part owner	6,000	6,000	6,000
W. A. Gray:				S. M. Glenn	do	Partnership	3,600	4,000	4,000
Mullens, S.C.	722,604	2,331,342	724,066	V. B. Shulburne	do	Warehouseman	3,600	4,000	4,000
Fremont, N.C.		2,266,244	860,566	S. B. Baughman	do	Warehouseman	1,800	1,800	1,800
Durham, S.C.			1,753,647	J. N. Gorman	do	Part Owner	5,000	5,000	5,000
Total redried in plants in which officials were interested.	24,588,908	50,803,244	42,889,058	J. R. Haynes	Half interest	Assistant director warehouse department	5,000	7,125	(1)
Total redried in all plants.	51,317,116	115,470,877	77,880,563	D. E. Gray	Son of W. A. Gray	Grader	1,800	2,500	3,200
Per cent redried in plants in which officials were interested.	47.9	44.0	55.0						

¹Not ascertained.

Total three crops redried in plants in which officials were interested.
Total three crops redried in all plants.
Average per cent redried in plants in which officials were interested

Mr. Williams and Mr. Patterson discussed the redrying and storage problems of the association.

The minutes do not show that a resolution authorizing association officials to engage in the redrying business was adopted, although the various members of the executive committee agree that the policy was approved by the committee and that the charges would not exceed \$1.75 per hundred pounds. The following members were present: G. A. Norwood, Oliver J. Sands, Joseph M. Hurt, J. A. Brown, N. H. Williams, S. F. Austin; also Messrs. Watkins, Craig, Patterson, and Breedlove. Brown and Hurt voted against approving the policy. It is probable, therefore, that the majority of the board of directors were at least aware of the connection of certain officials with redrying concerns when the 1924 crop was handled. Suit was instituted by J. A. Wade in the United States district court in behalf of the membership against T. C. Watkins, R. R. Patterson, F. R. Edmondson, and the association to recover \$500,000 alleged secret profits made in redrying but was dismissed on jurisdictional grounds. Suit was then filed in the Virginia State court which is now pending. This suit was discussed at a meeting of the board of directors August 14, 1925, as is shown by the following from the minutes of the association:

Mr. Sapiro discussed the suit brought by Mr. J. A. Wade, of Halifax County, against the association.

There was a discussion of the proceeding and action of the executive committee of this association at its meeting of June 9, 1923. This matter was considered in detail by the board. It appeared by the clear and uncontradicted statements of Messrs. Austin, Hurt, Sands, Norwood, and Williams, who were members of the executive committee and present at that meeting, that there was a resolution passed by the executive committee at that meeting authorizing officers, directors, and employees of this association to invest in redrying plants and redry tobacco for this association. It was further brought out by statements of Mr. M. O. Wilson, who was secretary for the committee and present at the meeting, that such a resolution was passed and that he, as usual, made a memorandum of same. It was further brought out by a statement of Mr. Wilson and Associate Counsel Joyner that when the minutes were written up by Mr. Wilson and by Mr. Joyner, who had not been present at the meeting, the resolution relative to redrying was omitted from the minutes of the executive committee meeting.

Upon motion, it was resolved and ordered by the board of directors that the minutes of the executive committee of June 9, 1923, be corrected by the insertion in them of the resolution originally passed by the committee; and the secretary of this board and of the executive committee is hereby instructed to amend said minutes and insert in said minutes the original resolution in words as nearly the original words as can now be re-

produced. There were present and voting for this resolution among the other directors the following members of the executive committee of June 9, 1923: Messrs. Austin, Hurt, Sands, Norwood, and Williams.

Commenting on this interesting procedure, the Commission's report says:

No evidence was submitted to indicate that the membership has approved the action of the executive committee in 1923 and as approved by the board of directors in August, 1925.

Oldest Bible Manuscript

So many readers have been interested in Professor Sanders' story of the oldest known manuscript of the Old Testament, which appeared in our issue of October 31, that more information on the subject will undoubtedly be welcome.

Next week Professor Sanders will further explain the rare fragments of papyrus containing portions of the books of the Bible, and these will be illustrated by reproductions of the oldest known manuscript of the Scriptures which is now preserved in the University of Michigan. One leaf of this precious papyrus was restored from no fewer than thirty-nine fragments.

The tobacco co-operative marketing associations have been incorporated for the purpose of engaging in all activities connected with the marketing of tobacco and with authority to finance any operations in connection therewith. The Burley and Dark Associations purchased redrying plants and redried their own tobacco with the exception that during the first year of operation they contracted with private redriers in localities where they had not as yet obtained redrying facilities.

On the other hand, the tri-State association, until the 1925 crop, had all of its tobacco redried by private concerns. The average cost to this association of redrying tobacco in 1922 was \$1.80 per hundred pounds, in 1923, \$1.74 per hundred pounds, and, in 1924, \$1.79 per hundred pounds, or an average for the three years of about \$1.75. The Burley association redried in its own plants during the three years about the same quantity of tobacco at an average cost of \$0.71 per hundred pounds. It is evident that the policy adopted by the tri-State association resulted in a loss to the association. Even at the average cost of the Edmondson Tobacco Co. for the years 1922 and 1923, viz., \$1.05, the saving to the association in redrying 219,866,812 pounds, the total quantity of association tobacco redried by private redrying con-

cerns in 1922, 1923, and 1924, would have represented about \$1,500,000.

The important data with respect to the redrying operations of the tri-State association, including a comparison of net financial returns to the grower on green sales with redried sales, are shown in the last annual audit of this co-operation made by F. W. La Frentz & Co., public accountants. These data, recently secured by the commission and submitted herewith, show that the total cost of redrying the growers' tobacco, including carrying charges, to May 31, 1925, was \$4,332,598.95 on the 1923 crop and \$2,843,918.98 on the 1924 crop, a total for the two years of \$7,176,496.93. It will be noted in this exhibit that the net average return per pound to the grower was substantially larger on the parts of the 1923 and 1924 crops which were sold green than on the parts which were marketed in redried order.

The policy of the tri-State association with respect to redrying has been changed for the crop year 1925. At the present time it has under lease and is operating, on a cost basis, redrying plants at Danville, Va.; South Boston, Va. (2 plants); Darlington, S. C.; Rocky Mount, N. C. (2 plants); and Kingstree, S. C.

There is quite enough in all this to account for the very serious situation in which the tobacco co-operatives find themselves. The facts are so bad that they have never been made known to the membership. If the books were opened, as of this writing, it would be found that the whole structure was honeycombed by decay. It is only a matter of time when the incurable weakness of the Sapiro system will be manifest to all its hundreds of thousands of victims.

Did the Sapiro Tobacco Cooperatives bring any benefit to the farmers?

No; the farmers lost—on their own sales—\$11,422,167 in 1922; they lost \$10,015,317 in 1923.

The 1924 and 1925 figures are not available.

These statements are substantiated by the following report compiled from the Year Book of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Report of the Federal Trade Commission.

To contend that these figures do not represent a loss to the Co-operative membership is to imply that the Co-operatives are composed of inferior farmers producing inferior grades of tobacco in the same locality.

STATEMENT showing net return to members of the Tobacco Growers' Co-operative Association, after deducting all operating expenses and reserves, on their 1922 and 1923 deliveries (F. T. C. report, pp. 122 to 125) as compared with nonmembers returns over the auction markets (U. S. Dept. of Agric. 1923 Yearbook, Table 390, p. 867)

	Pounds delivered to pool	Amount available for distribution or remitted to members	Average per pound	Price paid on open market (U. S. Agric. Yearbook)	Auction markets excess per pound over pool average	Total difference on basis of pounds delivered to pool
1922: South Carolina	20,032,214	\$3,103,985.16	15.5	23.0	7.5	\$1,502,416
Eastern Carolina	23,228,106	4,424,336.94	19.0	29.7	10.7	2,485,407
Old Belt	89,925,280	21,159,480.37	23.5	30.2	6.7	6,024,994
Virginia Dark	26,824,376	3,812,230.53	14.2	18.8	4.6	1,233,921
Virginia Sun-Cured	3,580,193	338,023.39	9.4	14.3	4.9	175,420
Totals	163,590,169	32,838,056.39				11,422,167
1923: South Carolina	34,532,990	5,955,403.13	17.2	24.0	6.8	2,348,243
Eastern Carolina	26,945,141	4,859,313.17	16.2	24.0	7.8	2,101,721
Old Belt	91,490,584	15,434,708.31	16.9	22.3	5.4	4,940,492
Virginia Dark	24,149,287	3,705,738.90	15.3	17.9	2.6	627,881
Virginia Sun-Cured	3,019,950	336,546.73	11.1	11.0		(3,020)
Totals	180,137,952	29,791,710.24				10,015,317

It is evident that the policy adopted by the tri-State association resulted in a loss to the association. Even at the average cost of the Edmondson Tobacco Co. for the years 1922 and 1923, viz., \$1.05, the saving to the association in redrying 219,866,812 pounds, the total quantity of association tobacco redried by private redrying con-

"American Audiences Are Fine"

VISITING Primrose Hill sounds as if I had been rambling along the countryside; so some hundred years ago I should have been doing.

The policy of the tri-State association with respect to redrying has been changed for the crop year 1925. At the present time it has under lease and is operating, on a cost basis, redrying plants at Danville, Va.; South Boston, Va. (2 plants); Darlington, S. C.; Rocky Mount, N. C. (2 plants); and Kingstree, S. C.

I waited a few minutes in a delightful room; cream walls; chintz and china; flowers and brown leaves in many vases; variedly interesting pictures in silver-gray frames; a baby grand piano; a wide-mouthed gramophone; over all an atmosphere of coziness and comfort.

In came my victim, briskly; apologizing for having kept me waiting; but I assured him, truthfully, that it was I who was at fault for being before my time, adding:


"Surely so good a musician always keeps good time?"

Whereat he laughed, indulgently; we sat, lighted cigarettes, and got busy with talk.

Henry Joseph Wood was born in London in the year 1869, but he carries his years very lightly. His career has been varied; conductor of many foremost opera companies and orchestral societies, and at many theaters; to us in London chiefly endeared as the conductor and moving spirit of the Queen's Hall Promenade Concerts, which were founded in 1895, and which each autumn are more admirable in their catholicity and quality and ever more popular; conductor of the Queen's Hall Symphony Concerts and of an excellent series of Sunday concerts.

"American audiences?"

"Fine! So keen; out to learn, and to appreciate. I gave them a good deal of Handel that was fresh to them; as a rule I found that they did not know, had not had the chance of hearing, much of him except the *Messiah*. One very fine musical feature over there is the way so many rich men take pleasure in music and in supporting musical



*Adagio e molto expressivo
Truly yours
Henry J. Wood*

You've heard of the Hollywood Bowl? It's an amazing place. A natural out-of-door concert hall. Holds over twenty thousand persons; and it was full for each of the concerts. The acoustics are wonderful, everyone can hear perfectly. I tested this, walking round, when the other conductor, Mr. Reiner, was in charge. I've never had a more attentive, intelligent, appreciative audience. The orchestra, the Los Angeles Philharmonic, was splendid; it was a rare pleasure to conduct such musicians."

"What about the programs?"

"At each concert I made the central piece a British composition. I don't believe in an all-British program, anywhere; I put in a British composition each time, one of our masters in the good company of other great masters. Compositions by Vaughan Williams, Elgar, Ethel Smyth, Delius, Holst—his *Planets*, which was greatly appreciated. Oh, yes, and Purcell, giving his orchestral suite in C minor.

"American audiences?"

"Fine! So keen; out to learn, and to appreciate. I gave them a good deal of Handel that was fresh to them; as a rule I found that they did not know, had not had the chance of hearing, much of him except the *Messiah*. One very fine musical feature over there is the way so many rich men take pleasure in music and in supporting musical

Says Sir Henry Wood,
Famous Conductor of
Queen's Hall Orchestra
of London, England

By

W. TEIGNMOUTH SHORE

enterprises. They give their money lavishly and unselfishly.

"Our American trip," said Sir Henry, "was a holiday and a rest." "California?"

"The climate! I can't tell you what it is; it's perfect. The still air every night; the wonderful stars—I shall never forget those concerts out in the open—in that vast amphitheater under those glorious stars; and twenty thousand persons listening, absolutely silent. It was unforgettable; it was inspiring."

"Very different to a stuffy concert hall! I should love to have been there. Were the concerts free?"

"No; but only twenty-five cents were charged. Then, at each exit, there were big golden bowls, into which those who felt that way could drop an offering; a big note, maybe, perhaps only a dime. From this source Mrs. Carter gets quite considerable sums, which go to the support of the orchestra. I do hope to go there again; perhaps next year; and I've been invited to conduct concerts at New York, Boston, Cincinnati."

"Tell me more," I said, greedily. "New York? What about music there?"

"One thing I was told by musicians there. The star conductors who go there are much too rigidly confined in the selection of their programs. I was told that during a period of six weeks, the various orchestras had given four performances of Tchaikovsky's Fifth Symphony and three performances of Brahms's First Symphony. For my part, I do my best, without being faddy, to give variety; to get a bit off the beaten track."

"You've been to America before, I know?"

"Yes, and always had a good time. I was there, dear, dear, twenty-one years ago, as the first guest-conductor of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. Then ten years ago for the second time I was offered the conductorship of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. I had to decline; I felt that we should all stick to the old country during that awful war. In spite of the air raids, and all the gloom and distress, we kept the concerts going all through at the Queen's Hall, sometimes with very small audiences; but we did our bit, we musicians."

"What about American composers?" "There are some young ones of very great promise."



HYNES E. TERRY is, perhaps, the best known among all that little body known as the "guide trust" operating in the nation's Capitol. He is one of the most popular men who ever filled a post of such public contact. Senators and Congressmen call on him to carry through their special constituents, diplomats, distinguished foreigners and important delegations.




He Guides People Through the Capitol

DO YOU wish to go through the Capitol and see all the work and art in its history? It is twenty-five cents apiece. All paid. Follow me, little ladies." (Guide conducts party to front portico of Capitol.)


"Now the front of the Capitol; George Washington made this part, the front, which is east, the cornerstone ceremonies being held September 18, 1793.

Far to your left you see the tree that was planted by Washington when he laid the cornerstone and out here (immediately in front) is where they build the platform on which they inaugurate the President of the United States each four years. Lincoln was the first President to be inaugurated here, as have all succeeding Presidents, all the way down to President Coolidge. In the grounds there are 64 acres, and the Capitol building covers three. The first part of the Capitol here is of sandstone from Maryland, painted every seven years to make it compare with the Lee marble in the House and Senate wings.

"The doors are the Rogers' bronze



Above—At the front of the Capitol building, the doors designed by Randolph Rogers in Rome and molded in Munich in 1860. Right—Looking up 180 feet at Brumidi's masterpiece, in the rotunda.



doors, which represent the life and history of Columbus. They were molded in Munich, Bavaria, in 1860.

The first panel represents Columbus presenting his credentials, stating that the world is round, asking for aid, which is refused him. In the next panel he is receiving a letter from Father Perez, and also a letter from the king and queen in which they agree to finance him; and the last panel depicts him starting on his voyage.

"Above the doors is where Columbus lands at San Salvador. The next panel to your right—Columbus coming into contact with

the natives. The next panel—bringing the natives back as a witness and proof of his discovery. The next panel—he is arrested on false charges; and the last is where he dies in a prison tomb. The doors weigh ten tons and cost \$28,500. They were put in place in 1865. Come on, children, follow me!

"Little family, stand back to the wall! See Brumidi's masterpiece. He received \$39,500 for that painting, and finished it in 1865. It represents Washington in the center, to the right is Peace, to the left is Victory. Thirteen female figures in the center represent the original thirteen states. The one with the shield is Freedom, the next, Agriculture, Mechanics, Science, and Art and Commerce. On the copper bowl (across the roof of the dome), 21 feet deep, 65 feet across, are six thousand square feet of painted surface. Then in 1877 Brumidi started the frieze, 300 feet around, 65 feet from the floor, 9 feet high, painted in the wet plaster.

"First is the landing of Columbus at San Salvador. Next, Cortez in the halls of Montezuma, the son of the sun, in Mexico. The one with the horse and sword is Pizarro, conqueror of Peru. The one in the boats—the midnight burial of De Soto in the Mississippi River. The next is Pocahontas saving the life of Captain John Smith. Standing is the Landing of the Pilgrims; kneeling is Penn's Treaty. At that spot (pointing) Brumidi fell from the scaffold. Two months after that the fright brought on his death. Please note in the light part the early settlers building in the New England States. At that point (indicating) is where Costaginia took up his work after the death of

Brumidi. Notice the different colors in the background. The next group is Governor Oglethorpe, of Georgia, negotiating his treaty with the Indians. The next represents the first shot fired in the Revolutionary War, a the Battle of

Lexington. The next is the reading of the Declaration of Independence on the steps of Independence Hall. The next is the surrender of General Cornwallis. The next is the death of the Indian chief, Tecumseh, chief of the confederacy of Indians. The next is General Scott entering Mexico, and the last on the frieze shows the discovery of gold in California, in '48.

"There (pointing) is where the Italian artist wished to paint the picture of Cleveland touching a button to start the World's Fair. Congress did not grant permission, so he quit. Now there is where they have an appropriation to finish the frieze by picturing the great World War. Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, got a \$40,000 appropriation through Congress to finish it. Now behind you, you will see the four imaginary pictures; the first is the embarkation of the Pilgrims, the next is the landing of Columbus at San Salvador, De Soto's discovery of the Mississippi River. (That picture cost \$12,000, the other three here cost \$10,000.) The last is the baptism at Jamestown of the Indian princess Pocahontas.



"To your right are the famous Colonel John Trumbull pictures. He was a secretary on Washington's staff, and the paintings are sketched from life. In 1819 Trumbull sent a letter to the superintendent of the buildings and grounds, when they were preparing to build the center part of the Capitol, stating that if they would reserve a place for his pictures he would sell them to the government. In 1820 they started the center of the Capitol and in 1827 they finished it. Trumbull sold the paintings for \$8,000 apiece, and they were placed here in 1828.


"Now, my family, follow me please. (Passes through corridor toward Senate wing.) In here is the original part of our Capitol. Washington laid the cornerstone September 18, 1793. It was occupied in the year 1800, and Wash-

ington died before it was finished. This is the first dome of our Capitol and beneath is the tobacco rotunda. Occupied in the year 1800, it was burned by the British in 1814. The Capitol then moved to Seventh and E streets, N. W., then from there to First and Maryland avenue, N. E., and, upon reconstructing the Capitol in 1820, Congress came back home.

"Beneath us is the room that Mark Twain good-naturedly called our national cuspidor. To your left is our

land and laid in 1856. They could not duplicate this floor on the House side; so, they are putting down an Alabama marble.

"The busts you see along here are of the different Vice-Presidents. You will see Roosevelt, Sherman and Stevenson, and the next one you will see out here will probably be that of President Coolidge. This next statue is by Hiram Powers, and shows Franklin studying electricity. (Moves around to east of Senate floor.) On the wall



Above—The House of Representatives, which with the Senate (left), constitutes Congress. Republican Senators sit on the right-hand side, and Democrats on the left.

you see the largest oil painting on canvas in the Capitol. The battle of Lake Erie, September 10, 1813, Commodore Perry changing his flag from the *Lawrence* to the *Niagara*. It was after this famous battle that Commodore Perry sent the message, if you can read it far above: 'We have met the enemy and they are ours.' Painted by Powers. (Moves to Senate balcony.)

"Now this room here is the Senate, composed of ninety-six Senators, two Senators from each state, elected for six years. The right-hand side is the Republican side, and the left-hand side is the Democratic side. (Someone in the party asked where was the Socialist side. Terry replied: 'Outside.') Vice-President Dawes is constitutional president of the Senate and he presides over that body when in session. The Senate and House together constitute Congress. (Passes out and around corridor.) This painting shows the battle of Chapultepec, September 13, 1847. General Scott's army entering Mexico. (West end Senate Chamber.) Below here you see the statue of Hancock, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. (Passes to north side of Senate Chamber.)

"Now the next room is the President's room, where he receives the Senators on the last day of Congress, to finish the work before the House and Senate. He signs the bills here on


this old table, which was first used by Lincoln, and by all Presidents since, all the way down to President Coolidge. Now see the beautiful decorations here. Brumidi decorated this; he spent almost six and one-half years in this one room. The side walls are in oil and represent Washington and the first Cabinet; the ceiling is of water-color paint, representing Legislation, Liberty, and Religion. Notice the wonderful, beautiful colors.

"All of my family please sit down in the President's chair and look at the chandelier. Seventeen years ago it was an old black bronze and it cost about \$25,000 to gold plate it with 22-carat gold. The floor is terra cotta tile.

"Now is there any question you wish to ask me? (Out of the door and down the steps.) The stairway here is the private stairway for the Senators and the President, and below you can see the wonderful corridor decorated by Brumidi. Side walls are in oil and the ceiling water color paint. (Stops at Senate end of corridor and points south.) From this Senate corridor to the House corridor is the longest corridor in any capitol in the world, 751 feet 4 inches long. Here is the Senate Committee Room on appropriations, Senator Warren is chairman. On this side here is our dining room.

"To your right here is the room formerly occupied by Senator Lodge. Here he used to send me through with the people from foreign countries. The last one I took through with him was Sir Esme Howard, the British Ambassador, and Representative Stephen Porter, of Pennsylvania, on the House side, was also in the party. In front of the Capitol Senator Lodge asked me why the city went out to the east. Not knowing Sir Howard was connected with Scotland, I stated that a Scotsman bought all the property to the east and was profiteering. So they built a bridge across the James street canal to the west of the Capitol, opened a store, Washington sold his property to the east, the city went out to the northwest and the Scotsman lost out. And Howard said: 'Don't be too hard on my family. We are not hard on yours.'

"This has been a great joke on me from that day to this. This warned me always to be careful as to what you say in the presence of diplomats. (Passes on through lower floor toward House side.) The only part left of the original Capitol is this floor. The old part was destroyed by the British in 1814, but this floor remains of our original Capitol of September 18, 1793. The side walls remain, but the inner part



Statuary Hall, which served for fifty years up to 1857 as the second House of Representatives. Twenty-nine states have here placed statues of their distinguished citizens.

where he died February 23, 1848. Then the State of Massachusetts put this tablet here. Adams always complained of echoes of voices before he died. It was just the wonderful acoustics in this room. (Then Terry demonstrated the acoustic properties of the room.) Next is the 1857 part of the House of Representatives. (Passes to west end of House floor.)

"Back here is the *Westward Ho* picture, the immigration wagon train from the East to the West, over the Rocky Mountain trail, and into the lowlands of the Pacific Coast, and the discovery of gold in California, in '48. This shows the forty-niners on their way out and the setting of the picture is in the Eastern Rocky Mountains in the State of Wyoming, looking into the Yellowstone Park. This is the part here (indicating)

that went to California. Back in camp is the part that went to Oregon. It was painted by Elmer Leitzel, in 1863, who was complimented on the picture by Lincoln.

"This is the picture from which *The Covered Wagon* was made. Then below you see another picture, beautiful Golden Gate, looking into San Francisco Bay. Over to your right is the Seal Rock, the Cliff House, the Sutro Heights. A little farther on is the Devil's Rocks, where the *Rio Janeiro* sank about 1900. It is more than 100 feet deep there. You see there the Twin Peaks. Mountains. The little red building is Fort Winfield Scott. Just beyond it is Presidio, San Francisco. Across the bay is Oakland. And the large mountain back there is Mt. Tamalpais. You can see Berkeley, and the island in San Francisco Bay is the Alcatraz Island; it is a military prison. To your left is Fort Baker, the tallest fort in the United States. It is sometimes called the Gibraltar of America, and the group of islands you see there are a group of the Farallon Islands that extend thirty miles out from the beautiful Golden Gate, which at its narrowest point is 2½ miles across and about 200 feet deep.

"Now this next room is the room of a very wonderful friend of mine, Representative Stephen Porter, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives. I have taken many a distinguished party from this room through the courtesy of Mr. Porter, and tried to explain to them the history of our Capitol. I have had the pleasure of meeting most of the Presidents' wives and families, most of the Senators and Representatives, and the Cabinet officers. They have all been very fine to me.

"This next room is our House of Representatives, where Speaker Longworth, of

Ohio, presides. The seat was just vacated by Senator Gillette, of Massachusetts. There are 444 chairs and 435 Congressmen. The second desk in front is where the President reads his message to the joint session of the House and Senate. The Senators take the three front rows of seats, Supreme Court Justices sit in chairs in front, and Representatives stand in the rear. The galleries are open to the public and the clock there governs the time for the House of Representatives. That is the clock which they turn back on the fourth of March to finish the work of the House of Representatives. Now you ask why they do not have desks. Because these Representatives toil ten and twelve hours a day in their private offices, and in committee rooms, so the four tables you see

there handle all the work that is before the House and desks would be superfluous. The chairmen of the committees handle the work on the floor. (Passes to back of House floor.) Back here is the Speaker's lobby and all the pictures you see are of the ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives. Our first Speaker was Mollinburg, of Pennsylvania, and all the other Speakers here you see have their portraits. One grand fellow was Champ Clark, whose picture you see here; a grand old soul was he. On this side is Uncle Joe Cannon, who has been in here 400 years; he told me so himself. He is now living in Danville, Illinois. There are four Speakers still living, Longworth, Gillette, Cannon, and Kieffer, of Ohio, who always wore a dress suit.

"Now this takes you to that famous painting, the *Proclamation of Emancipation*, showing Lincoln and his war cabinet; it was painted by Francis Carpenter, of New York, and presented by Miss Elizabeth Thompson, of Connecticut.

"Now, my little family, if there are any questions that you wish to ask me, before you leave, relating to the Capitol or the city or where you can find your Representative or Senator, I will be glad to answer or advise you. If there are none, goodby and God bless you."

Passing of the Bells

PRACTICALLY every youth passes through the stage of collecting—stamps, coins, autographs, if he be esthetic; fishhooks, tops and marbles, if he be but human. It is an instinct of youth, and it may be indicative of our youth as a nation that many of the finest collections in the world are found in America.


A curious and unique American collection is a garden of bells, attractively arranged at Glenwood Mission Inn, California. The collector became protector of the bells when his daughter gave him, as a Christmas present, in 1905, a curious bell with the Medici coat of arms. Historical objects had a fascination for Mr. Miller, and this bell appealed to his imagination and opened to him the large possibilities in old bells of various ages and countries and peoples.

His quest led him to all parts of the world. Bells are very often remelted, and it was in visits to foundries that he discovered and rescued from oblivion many of his most interesting and valuable bells.

To the poet the bell has always had a distinct fascination. Too often taken for granted, the bell has long played an important rôle in the life of civilization. Poe has perhaps expressed most realistically the place various bells have in our lives, and how much more was this true in the lives of our forefathers, when bells were used far more than now.

Sleigh bells, who hears them now? The little tinkling bell over shop doors. Church bells—they grow more and more silent with the years. The milkman's bell. The little bell that stood on the teacher's desk. Cowbells. Bells on horses that pulled the street cars.

A change has come over our way of living, and this change, to a great extent, has marked the passing of the bell. In its place, we have numerous and divers whistles and electric bells. So the old bell, with its beauty or eccentricity of form, its careful workmanship and interesting inscription, and its variety of tone, is being relegated to the scrap heap of civilization. America boasts, in the Glenwood Mission Inn, the largest collection of bells in the world.



—that San Francisco Lodge No. 21 B'Nai Brit finds that its Jewish brothers are not always amenable to Americanization plans. One of its reports says:

"It might not be amiss to state here that we have already decided to change the name of our committee so that it is hereafter to be known as the 'Committee on American Citizenship.' The reason for this is that the word 'Americanization' implies a changing or making-over, a standardization, and to some people smacks of Prussianism. The committee believes that many in need of enlightenment did not attend the lectures because of this impression that the lectures were for those who were not yet Americanized. To many of our faith, the word 'Americanization' connotes conversion to Christianity.

"Now, my little family, if there are any questions that you wish to ask me, before you leave, relating to the Capitol or the city or where you can find your Representative or Senator, I will be glad to answer or advise you. If there are none, goodby and God bless you."

"It is very apparent that it is a difficult matter to impress aliens, foreign-born and even native-born, with the value of understanding the fundamentals and ideals of American government. There is a regrettable indifference to this subject at present, since there is no great urgency or national crisis to stimulate interest. As evidence of this, it is only necessary to state that of the fifty aliens who enrolled, but five or so attended the lectures, the others giving various excuses for not being able to attend.

"Although we have been organized only about four months, we have assisted sixty applicants for citizenship. The sincere appreciation of those we have aided convinces us that we are fulfilling a long-felt need."

—that Jane Cowl, the actress, predicted at Harvard the other day that spoken drama would vanish from America within the next decade or so. For years motion pictures have been weaning patrons from the legitimate theaters. Where fifteen years ago

there were 1,540 theaters available for productions on tour, today there are only 674. Many elements contribute to this condition: traveling expenses are higher; railway rates, actors' salaries, hotel bills, operating disbursements are almost double; long jumps must be made between cities. But other factors also enter in, factors attributable directly to the producers and managers. Second rate companies are sent on tour, billed as "the original Broadway cast."

Extravagant claims are made for inferior productions. The public has become wary. But the theatrical men have made worse errors than these. Instead of improving their product and reducing their price, they have taken the opposite—and fatal—course of boosting price and lowering quality! And so we have what we have.

—that John Stachel, secretary of the Communist party in this country, declares that Reds spent close to \$1,000,000 last year in propaganda aiming at the eventual establishment of a Soviet government in the United States. The money was used in educating workers to Soviet doctrines, to foment the awaited "revolution of the proletariat," and to bring labor organizations into the ranks of the Bolsheviks. It is a vast sum, \$1,000,000, but the Communists hope to raise still more this year.

But isn't it rather a significant commentary on the futility of the Communists' program that, after spending \$1,000,000 and more a year in the effort to make the American worker discontented with his lot, they still fail?

—that prohibition has brought about another horrible situation. Many of the imposing college clubs in New York City whose memberships are made up of alumni now located in the big city are having to cope with financial deficits that have resulted from the losses of the former juicy profits from the bars. If the object of higher education is a handsome club building in New York, the maintenance of which is normally made possible by a barroom, then prohibition is indeed a hardship on the college boys, a hardship that seems to be destined to continue indefinitely.

—that forty-five persons were killed and two hundred were more or less severely injured by gunshot wounds during the brief 1925 autumn hunting season in Pennsylvania. This record of tragedies indicates that the hunters in the woods are becoming more numerous than the game. In Michigan there were five times as many hunters as deer. Under such conditions, accidents are inevitable. Sport cannot be conducted with all modern conveniences without some very dire inconveniences. As modernly conducted it is less a sport than a mad scramble. There is another angle: on the fringes of the hunting regions the mortality among farm livestock sighted by reckless huntsmen is very high, and complaining farmers are seldom compensated by the invaders. The wholesale slaughter of wild life is one of the curious practices which would impress an observer from Mars as passing strange.

—that mules killed fifty persons in Mississippi last year according to the State Bureau of Vital Statistics. Twenty-five years ago, the newspapers were constantly recording deaths caused by runaway horses in city and country, and persons were being either killed or badly injured while handling those animals in the barn and barnyard and at work in the field. When we consider the slow speed of a runaway horse, and the frequency of accidents to children and others through being "run over" by light horse-drawn vehicles, it seems that great improvements have been made. The motor car has brought, for the first time order into traffic.

—that Henry J. Allen, Wichita publisher and sometime governor, addressed the Kansas state chamber of commerce upon the possibility that the present craze for business mergers may not be so good. "Merging seems to be in the air," said Mr. Allen who sniffed and went on to say that, "behind these mergers in a great many instances lies the sale of stocks and bonds on profits built from the fruits of the merger. Because we are in that vast speculative age which we characterize as 'big business' the spirit of merger has almost become a disease."

Aviation from the Navy's Viewpoint



"The Use of Aircraft to Defeat the Enemy Forces on or Over the Sea Is a Naval Function," Says the Captain



ADVOCAKES of an Independent Air Service propose to create an additional Executive Department of the Government to control civil, commercial and military aviation. Military aviation would be controlled through the agency of an Independent Air Service under this new Department of Aéronautics. Neither the Army nor Navy would have aviation of their own, but units of the Independent Air Service would be detailed to operate with the Army and Navy; in time of peace, presumably at the discretion of the Department of Aéronautics.

A bill, H. R. 10,147, known as the Curry Bill, has been introduced in Congress with the provisions indicated above. Although its title does not mention the Army or Navy, this measure, if enacted into law, would completely disrupt the agencies charged with the National Defense. No other piece of legislation ever proposed had the potential power to destroy at once the efficiency of both the Army and Navy. No bill ever contemplated such radical changes in our system of national defense. The Navy desires that the people of the United States shall consider the effects of this bill most seriously and with a full realization of the consequences which would follow its adoption.

Naval aviation, under the Navy Department, is progressing more rapidly than aviation in the British Navy under an Independent Air Service. As a matter of fact the Independent Air Service in Great Britain is a failure.

The first main feature of the Curry Bill is the formation of an agency for the control of civil and commercial aviation.


The Navy Department believes in the formation of an agency for the control, regulation and encouragement of civil and commercial aviation, and has given its approval to H. R. 10,522, known as the Winslow Bill, which in its opinion provides adequately for civil and commercial needs. An organization providing for one agency to control both commercial aviation and military aviation is fundamentally wrong. Either commercial or military aviation will be neglected. There is no more reason for putting military aviation under the agency which controls civil and commercial aviation than there is to put the Navy under the Shipping Board.

The Navy's attitude toward civil aviation is expressed in the statement of United States Naval Policy promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy, December 1, 1922. This policy contains the following: "To give every possible encouragement to avia-

By CAPTAIN W. S. PYE, U. S. N.
CONCLUSION

tion in civil life, with a view to advancing the art and to provide aviators available for war." The Navy has always extended its facilities to civilian flyers and has often assisted commercially operated airplanes with service and emergency repairs at considerable effort on the part of naval personnel. Naval aircraft and naval vessels have frequently searched wide regions of the sea for civilian planes reported missing.

The Navy fully realizes the need of developing commercial aviation as a potential asset for war, but does not believe that commercial aviation can be made a successful proposition simply by act of Congress. Neither an Air Department nor an Independent Air Service, *ipso facto*, will create a flourishing aircraft industry. The Winslow Bill, which the Navy Department



Loading a seaplane. The lower picture shows sailors conveying a live bomb to Navy plane. The upper picture shows the method of carrying torpedoes under the wings of a Curtiss plane.

approves, would create a bureau in the Department of Commerce to control, regulate and encourage civil and commercial aviation. It would not affect Army or Navy aviation. The creation of a separate department to control aviation could be justified only on the score of necessity. In the view of most persons who have studied the subject, no such necessity exists.

design and construction of ships, the best results will be obtained under the existing arrangement.

Naval aircraft bomb-sights, guns, bombs and torpedoes are designed and manufactured under the trained expert personnel of the Navy Bureau of Ordnance. Engines for naval aircraft are tested and produced under trained engineer officers of the Navy.

The second feature of the Curry (Air Service) Bill contemplates the formation of an Independent Air Service under the proposed Department of Aéronautics, for the control of all military aviation including that now belonging to the Army and to the Navy. Only so much of the bill as affects the Navy will be discussed, although the provisions of the bill which are injurious to the Navy are in nearly all instances equally inimical to the Army.

Section 3 of this bill, stating the provinces and duties of the Department of Aéronautics, reads in part:

"That it shall be the province and duty of said Department of Aéronautics . . . (to) perform all duties heretofore assigned to the War, Post Office, Navy and Treasury departments, or any other department of the Government, except as may be hereinafter provided, in time of peace and war, in so far as they relate to aviation, which shall include . . . the responsibility for air defense . . . the supply of personnel, the instruction, training and equipping of air forces for the national defense and the development of heavier and lighter than air material . . ."

The three main ideas in the above quotation to which the Navy seriously objects may be stated tersely as follows:

The Department of Aéronautics:
(1) Shall perform all duties heretofore assigned to the Navy Department relating to aviation.
(2) Shall be responsible for air defense.

(3) Shall supply personnel for, and instruct, train and equip air forces for the national defense.

The duties relating to aviation involve practically every bureau of the Navy Department. The Navy has been interested in aircraft design for many years and has produced several of the leading aérodynamical engineers of the country.

In its present and future development, aviation is intimately connected with the design and construction of ships. Aircraft carriers, aircraft tenders, battleships and cruisers all carry aircraft. Because of the close association of the officers engaged in aircraft construction and design with those engaged in the

conduct of operations against the enemy naval forces and against the enemy air and land forces so long as they are embarked in ships. The Navy is responsible for the primary defense against all forces which approach the United States by sea.

The personnel for naval aviation is obtained and trained by the Navy, most of the personnel having served some time in the Navy before being assigned to aviation.

The supply and transportation of naval aviation material is handled by the Navy Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in just the same manner as any other naval material. Naval surgeons and naval hospitals are available for any service required for naval aviators. Aviation navigating instruments are designed and manufactured under the supervision of naval officers experienced in navigation.

These and many other agencies in the Navy Department which deal with aviation matters and aviation personnel would have to be partially duplicated in the new Department of Aéronautics, with a corresponding increase in the cost of such duplication.

It is possible for the Navy Department to stop all activities in relation to aviation, but such action would not materially reduce the cost of naval administration overhead, because nearly all of the agencies are employed on other naval work which would have to be continued. Such action would, however, deprive the Navy of control over the development of an effective arm of the Navy and cause a divided responsibility for naval efficiency.

The provision of this bill making one department responsible for defense against a particular form of attack is contrary to the generally accepted doctrine that the Army is responsible for the defense of the continental United States and permanently garrisoned outlying possessions and for other major operations on shore, and the Navy responsible for maintaining our sea communications intact and destroying those of the enemy.

The present doctrine is not founded upon the type of weapons used or the means by which war is conducted. It is based upon the nature of objectives.

The Curry Bill further provides that "The President shall be, and is hereby, authorized to attach such units of the Department of Aéronautics as may be necessary for the coöperation with the land and sea forces of the United States in time of war or threatened hostilities . . ." and later in the same section—"Should the offensive or defensive operations in time of war or threatened hostilities . . . be, from their nature, aéronautical, the President shall be, and he hereby is, authorized to assign to the Department of Aéronautics, such units of the armed land and sea forces as he may deem necessary."

These provisions are manifestly impractical. High command requires the strategic direction of all arms, and, even in the larger tactical operations, it is essential that command be exercised by an officer having knowledge of the use of all arms and special knowledge of the use of these arms in coöordination and coöperation with each other. The difficulty of determining whether attacks are or are not

from their nature aéronautical" is easily demonstrated by an example.

Strained relations exist with a European power. It is learned that the enemy fleet is mobilized and ready to start across the sea, and that, in addition to a number of troop transports, it is accompanied by aircraft carriers and other strong aviation units embarked in tenders, which, if a base near our coast is reached, may make its air force capable of making an air attack on our cities, or its expeditionary force capable of conducting landing operations.

would operate under the Air Service. If not, the Air Service presumably would operate under the Army and Navy high commands.

Let us assume further that the enemy succeeds in obtaining a base within the operating radius of planes from some of our large cities.

The Department of Aéronautics would undoubtedly claim that the operation had become primarily aéronautical in its nature and even if the Navy Department had had control of the operations thus far, such control would pass to the Department of Aéronautics.

The existing doctrine may possibly force a change of command during the progress of an operation, but only if the Navy becomes convinced of its inability successfully to execute its assigned task. It will be noted that the command is determined by tasks rather than by the nature of the forces employed. In the accomplishment of its task the Navy needs aircraft and what is more it needs its own aircraft with naval officer pilots. The Army, too, requires aviation, but as the Army is charged with the defense against air attack on our cities the Army aviation can be united in one counter-attacking force or divided to coöperate with land forces as may be required. The decision and the operations in accordance therewith would be in the hands of the commander of the Army forces in the field who would be advised by a trained staff in which all arms would be represented.

If there was one principle firmly established by the last war, it was that unity and continuity of command are essential to success. In this connection the conclusions of former Secretary Weeks relative to the Curry Bill are quoted:



"Summarizing the above remarks, I consider as the fundamental defects of H. R. 10,147 (Curry Bill):

"1st—The proposed organization creates a trinity of command for our defense forces, with divided control in every possible theater of operations, instead of that 'unity of command' which is the foundation of success in war.

"2nd—It proposed an Air Service which is not a permanent and integral part of the Army, thus violating the second great principle of military organization—that arms which are habitually to function together in battle form permanent parts of the same organization."

The Navy concurs most heartily with the Secretary of War in the above conclusions.

The Navy claims (1) that the aviation personnel of naval aircraft must be a part of the Navy with the same training, traditions, doctrines and methods of operation, as other naval personnel; (2) that the instruction and training of naval aviation personnel can be efficiently conducted only by naval officers trained in aviation. The naval aviator must be a seaman and have a thorough knowledge of naval operations



Landing a plane on an aircraft carrier. The United States Navy will soon have three of these carriers, two of them among the finest in the world. They now form an integral part of any battle fleet.

The question at once arises—Is the operation against such a fleet primarily naval, primarily aéronautical, or primarily military?

Under present instructions there can be no doubt about the responsibility for the conduct of operations against the enemy naval forces and against the enemy air and land forces so long as they are embarked in ships.

The Navy is responsible for the primary defense against all forces which approach the United States by sea.

By the proposed bill it would be necessary for the President to decide whether the anticipated enemy attack is primarily aéronautical, if so, the Army and Navy

before his special knowledge and ability as an aviator will be of much practical use; (3) that the naval aviation equipment differs materially in design from land equipment and that the coordination of aircraft design with the design of ships requires the control of the design of naval aircraft shall be retained by the Navy.

Naturally arguments likewise can be produced in support of the Independent Air Service idea. For this reason it is essential that we examine the British experience with the Independent British Royal Air Force. If Great Britain is satisfied that its system is efficient and operating satisfactorily it would constitute circumstantial evidence in favor of an Independent Service. If, on the other hand, inefficiency and waste are indicated, the warning should be heeded.

The existing situation in Great Britain will be discussed under the following headings: Organization, Economy, Operations, Technical Progress.

The advocates of a Department of Aeronautics and Independent Air Service continually refer to the fact that the British have an Air Ministry and an Independent Air Service, the Royal Air Force, and claim that these were created to meet the demands of war. They further claim that this organization has proved highly successful and that as a result of its creation Great Britain is now ahead of the United States in aeronautics. What are the facts?

The Royal Flying Corps, a part of the British Army, and the Royal Naval Air Service, a part of the British Navy, were amalgamated on April 1, 1918, as the Royal Air Force and placed under a separate department of the government called the Air Ministry.

The conditions which led up to this amalgamation were as follows: The Allied armies in France were hard pressed. The German fleet had been defeated at Jutland and was effectively contained. The British Navy was well supplied with aircraft and had at that time probably the most efficient air force in the world. The Navy, because of its major importance to Great Britain, had been given the priority in material.

Under these conditions, with the fate of the British Empire at stake, the British Navy agreed to the amalgamation of the Royal Flying Corps and Naval Air Service, in order to prevent friction which might result from dual control over aviation units to be operated in France with the British Army.

Although friction existed between the Navy and the Royal Air Force almost from the latter's creation, the situation was tolerated by the Navy without serious open antagonism until after the war was over. Since that time there has been continual friction which has resulted in frequent modification of the original idea until, at present, the British naval air force has been practically reestablished although it is still camouflaged as a part of the Royal Air Force.

According to the latest instructions all naval aircraft observers and seventy-five per cent of all pilots serving in naval aviation are to be naval personnel temporarily assigned to the Royal Air Force. The Admiralty now makes its own aviation budget and this is submitted as a part of the naval estimates. The Navy directs the types of planes to be constructed for its use and provides the specifications.

Because of the dual control which still exists due to temporarily commissioning naval officers in the Royal Air Force and to the many questions of rank and precedence to command which these double commissions create, the situation is still far from satis-

factory and has resulted in a low operating efficiency and neglect of an efficient war organization. The British press frankly admit that in naval aviation the United States is ahead of the British.

The advocates of an Independent Air Service claim that the creation of a Department of Aeronautics and a unified air service will prevent duplication of effort and result in economy. Quite the contrary has proved to be the case.

The creation of another department causes a complete duplication of effort of all administrative offices and services. The Royal Air Force has its own training stations, schools, hospitals and even its own corps of doctors, chaplains, supply officers, et cetera. Although the expenditures for British aeronautics have been large no effective air force has been produced. The situation can be no more clearly stated than in the following quotation from the London *Morning Post* of March 31, 1925:

"The facts concerning the efficiency and equipment of the airplanes of the Royal Air Force stated by our aeronautical correspondent give cause for the gravest misgivings. It has been admitted again and again in Parliament that the Air Force is deficient in numbers, and Ministers have affirmed that the requisite increase is being effected by degrees. But of what avail is an Air Force, however strong in numbers, if its machines are hopelessly inferior to the aircraft of other powers? So inferior are they that our correspondent does not hesitate to say that 'Britain now lacks aerial defense.' Now it is the first and last duty of the Air Ministry to provide for the aerial defense of this country. In order to fulfill that duty the Royal Air Force was given an independent existence; its presiding Ministry was erected into a Secretary of State, a position denied to the First Lord of the Admiralty; and the Ministry has been plentifully supplied with money from the public funds. The results, six years after the conclusion of peace, are as described by our aeronautical correspondent. There is an Air Ministry, but there is no aerial defense. Alike in achievement and in equipment, this country lags far behind France and the United States; and probably, if the truth were known, a long way behind Germany also. The Air Ministry has expended and is expending many millions upon plant, buildings, schools, colleges, aerodromes, and a numerous and costly staff. It has been officially stated that the policy of the Ministry is to provide the structure of a great organization which shall be ready to accommodate the future expansion of the fighting force. That is a perfectly intelligible policy; but its execution affords no excuse for the neglect of the weapon itself."

It has been reported in the British press that there are 2,400 persons employed in the Air Ministry to arrange for the maintenance and renewal of 640 airplanes and for the control of their pilots and mechanics.

The British Royal Air Force has failed both as a commercial organization and as a military organization and yet there are in this country many persons who, apparently unable to profit by the mistakes of others, are doing their best to cause the United States Government to adopt this faulty organization.

Even in the field of operations the Royal Air Force has not been a success. Commercially the British air lines have not been as efficient as the German or even some French lines. No commercial air routes are financially self-sustaining.

The British hold no world's records for speed, duration or climb. The friendly competition between our Army and Navy aviation is more conducive to rapid development than is "a bureaucratic ogre which sits on the throne and, through its know-it-all attitude, hampers the development of aviation."

It is a peculiarity of human nature that there are always some people fighting to get what other people are fighting to get rid of. There is ample evidence that the British Royal Air Force is a failure; why should the United States require further proof of the impracticability of the Independent Air Service theory?

There is a practical difficulty in the execution of the provisions of the Curry Bill authorizing the President under certain conditions to place Army and Navy forces under command of the Air Force. It is this. The Independent Air Service officer personnel, in all probability, would be made up almost entirely of officers of the present Army Air Service and civilians. In the Army Air Service there are but seventeen officers above the rank of major, and but five of the rank or above colonel. Do the people of the United States desire to turn over command of our land, sea, and air forces to such a small group of officers? Would it be possible for this small group to execute with efficiency the strategical direction of a war? The Army and Navy War colleges, in order to provide officers who are trained in the conduct of war, have a yearly attendance of approximately as many officers as there are in the Army Air Service above the rank of captain.

If such training is necessary, and experience has proved that it is, it is a foregone conclusion that the officers of the proposed Independent Air Service will not be efficient in the direction of the strategical operations of combined land, sea, and air forces.

It is hoped that the analysis contained in this series of articles has helped to clear up the fog which has prevented the public from seeing aviation as the Navy sees it. Let us not forget:

1. The Continental United States is safe from invasion and from attack by aircraft unless the troops or aircraft are brought to our coast by a foreign navy.

2. That the primary defense against troops or aircraft transported overseas lies in an efficient Navy.

3. That to make the Navy efficient in national defense, it must be equipped with air power to insure the accomplishment of its task.

4. That the defense of the Philippines, Panama Canal, Alaska, and other outlying possessions is dependent upon a fleet capable of controlling the vital lines of communication.

5. That the best defense is a vigorous offense.

6. That the safety and integrity of the United States and its possessions must rest always upon an efficient Navy, and that Navy must be adequately equipped with aircraft; that the use of aircraft to defeat the enemy forces on or over the sea is a naval function and for this function to be efficiently executed aircraft operating with the fleet and from naval air stations on shore must be designed, supplied, maintained, manned and commanded by the Navy of which such aircraft are an integral part.

Jewish Rabbi in Jerusalem Writes Jesus of Nazareth

(Concluded from page 6)

flounders more deeply when he attempts to treat the emergence in Jesus of the thought that he was Messiah. There seems to have been a brace of delusions, John thinking himself Elijah, Jesus thinking himself Messiah; which proves rather embarrassing to the writer who starts out to explain it all. Dr. Klausner thinks that in Jesus' case, it was the result of an extra bright day, the day Jesus was baptized: "Dazzled by the blinding light of the Judean sun, it seemed to him as though the heavens were opened and that the Shekinah shed its light upon him." (p. 252) Had the day been dark, perhaps the world had been spared Christianity! Who knows? Dazzled, obsessed and dreamy! Surely these are foundations too shallow on which to rear the edifice of twenty centuries of Christianity. I say that, not lightly, but following Dr. Klausner's own reasoning. He quotes approvingly Rousseau's saying: "My friend, such things are not invented; the matters told of Socrates—whose existence no one doubts—rests on far slenderer evidence than do those told of Jesus of Nazareth"—and—"It is far more incomprehensible that many men should have agreed to compose this book than that one man should have provided it with its subject matter . . . So impossible of imitation are the characteristics of the Gospels that the man who invented them must needs be greater than his hero." Again (p. 357) discussing the charge of fraud as connected with the story of the Resurrection, Dr. Klausner says: "That is impossible: deliberate imposture is not the substance out of which the religion of millions of mankind is created."

And still again (p. 359) discussing the scene with Doubting Thomas: "Here again it is impossible to suppose that there was any conscious deception; the nineteen hundred years' faith of millions is not founded on deception."

Is it then founded on an obsessed dreamer mistaking a flash of sunlight for the Shekinah?

It is by such light treatment of the weightiest matters in his book that Dr. Klausner falls from his position as a scholar. The treatment is not worthy his dignity as a thinker.

When he approaches the miracles (p. 267), Dr. Klausner admits "The problems of miracles in Jesus' ministry is difficult and complicated . . . Since modern science cannot imagine an effect without an external or internal cause, it is unable to rest content with the simple answers offered in the age of the Encyclopedists—that all the miracles attributed to Jesus, as well as to other great men in the world, are mere inventions deliberately contrived by 'cunning priests.'"

The author then proceeds to treat the miracles after the conventional "modernist" manner which succeeds neither in explaining them nor in explaining them away, a fact of which Dr. Klausner seems to be conscious, for he adds (p. 270), "This force which Jesus had, comprises some secret, some mystical element, still not properly studied by the ordinary psychologists and physicians and scientists, who are conversant only with the laws of nature so far determined by science." Something was done that remained, that required a kind and degree of power that we do not know; Jesus did the thing, and possessed the power,

but what it was we do not know. We simply agree to deny that it was miracle. That seems to be the attitude. And yet Dr. Klausner indicates that the power by which Jesus worked his miracles was also the power which accounts for his influence beyond his death (p. 270): "Jesus obviously had a power of 'suggestion,' of influencing others, to an unusual extent. Had not this been the case his disciples could never have held him in such veneration, remembering and teaching every word he spoke; nor could his memory have so persisted and so influenced their spiritual and earthly life; nor could they, in their turn, have so influenced thousands and tens of thousands by the power which they had derived from him."

And yet, after saying this, Dr. Klausner

being an observant Jew, as Dr. Klausner claims, would surely have known that the withered hand was not dangerous to life, and being also afraid to work miracles for fear he would fail, as Dr. Klausner claims, would not have done two doubtful, dangerous and uncalled-for things at once. Such passages as these illustrate the futility of trying to psychologize or psychoanalyze him who called himself the Son of Man. The attempts are not successful. Our forms are too small for the facts.

But this review must come to a close. Students of the Bible will find great interest in Dr. Klausner's discussion of the time of Jesus' death. His conclusions support the accepted view that the crucifixion occurred on Friday, Saturday being both the Sabbath and the Passover.

It is also worth noting that, although indulging in a good deal of hypothetical whitewashing of Judas (not objectionable in itself, but certainly not defensible on critical grounds), Dr. Klausner calls attention to the fact that Judas was the only Judean (as we should say, Jew) among the disciples. (p. 325) "Judas was an educated Judean . . . It was otherwise with the other disciples, all alike uneducated Galileans, dull of intellect, but warm-hearted."

This isolation of Judas confirms statements previously made in this paper. The judgment on the northern disciples as "dull of intellect" will have to take its chances when confronted by the Gospels of Matthew, Mark (Peter) and John.

As to responsibility for the death of Jesus, Dr. Klausner enters into a long review. Naturally there is in his mind the stigma which rests upon his race as a result of the crucifixion. And yet he does not deny any of the facts as they have been received by the Christian church. But he sets up matters worthy of acceptance, such as the fact that the ruling priestly party of the time did not represent the best Jewish sentiment, and that the trial before the Sanhedrin was in the nature of a preliminary investigation with recommendations. The Sanhedrin was competent to pass sentence of death, but not competent to execute the sentence. (p. 160) That was the prerogative of the civil power, then in the hands of the Romans. These statements, of course, accord with the facts: the Sanhedrin sentenced Jesus to death; the civil power approved the sentence and executed it. We may fully agree with Dr. Klausner when he says (p. 348): "A few only of the priestly caste had condemned Jesus to death and given him up to Pilate . . . The Jews, as a nation, were far less guilty of the death of Jesus than the Greeks, as a nation, were guilty of the blood of Socrates."

This review has observed the limits of the historical questions raised. There are others of equal interest which show Dr. Klausner to better advantage, in some respects. But as preserving the prevalent tone of the book, we close with another quotation (p. 342).

"Jesus was convinced of his messiahship; of this there is no doubt; were it not so he would have been nothing more than a mere deceiver and imposter—and such men do not make history: they do not found new religions which persist for two thousand years and hold sway among five hundred millions of civilized people."

The Unarmed Invited To Disarm!

The European powers would have another conference to relieve the United States of the few first-class battleships and naval armaments which it has remaining after previous treaty arrangements.

Read next week in
THE
DEARBORN INDEPENDENT
how this country
"Never Lost a War, But
Never Won a Conference"

When I Began to Know Bryan

(Concluded from page 2)

even if he were sporting a McKinley button. "I see you are not for me?" said Mr. Bryan as he took the upstretched hand.

"No, I'm not," said the boy frankly.

"Does your father feel that way, too?" asked the nominee.

"He sure does," answered the future voter.

When the Ides of November were come, Bryan's six million and more of the 1896 support held, but the war President and his robustious Rough Rider team-mate went above seven million. But sixteen years later Congress put into the Philippine enactment the guaranty of ultimate independence, the thing that Bryan went down in defeat for in that second battle.

Early it came to be his lot to lose his political life, that he might save it. *The Commoner*, published monthly in periodical or quarto form at Lincoln, Nebraska, became, he said, "one of our most valuable exchanges." While his brother looked after the mechanical and business details, Mr. Bryan maintained contact with his party through his contributions to its pages.

By clubbing arrangements with other publications, it obtained a fairly wide circulation up to the time of its dis-continuance.


He was able to report himself with fullness and accuracy that the eastern press, never friendly, was not disposed to accord him. Thus he enjoyed, in a measure not given to many party leaders, a twofold appeal—pen and voice. He wrote, if not brilliantly, with clearness and courage, out of the abundance of campaign experiences, upon issues he considered of paramount importance. Take that word "paramount" for example. That is as far as he ever ventured into the vocabulary of unfamiliar words. Straightaway statement, embellished now and then with fable, illustration, or Scriptural allusion, seemed to serve best the earnestness of his advocacy. Always he gave the impression of unalterable conviction.

Mr. Bryan was 42 years old in 1902. Physically he had thrived on defeat, weighing 205 pounds after the campaign of 1896, and 215 in 1902. It remained for the managing editor of the *Detroit Times*, Allan L. Benson, to warn Mr. Bryan that his always keen appetite might prove a handicap in his future political labors. Benson himself had become a disciple of Fletcherism, and had reduced his portly frame to athletic trim by the no-breakfast plan.

Meeting the Commoner at the train in Detroit for a special interview, he laid into the three-meal visitor with the ardor of a young dietary convert.

"Bryan, you're too fat!" was the greeting of Benson.

Bryan was not pleased; but he was slow to anger and plenteous in patience. He listened to Benson as he expounded the



One man—the telling marks of a long and strenuous life in politics.



Mr. Bryan as he looked many years ago, near the beginning of his famous career. The upper view was one of the last made of the Great Commoner.

characters which the French dismiss with the proverb: "The absent are always wrong."

The "scandals" associated with Mr. Bryan's dietary indiscretions, the carrying of a toothpick in his mouth, and permitting his coat to show wrinkles and his trousers bagginess, may be nearer the truth. Weightier matters crowded upon his mind at times, no doubt, than getting rid of the quill between his teeth and the shininess and creases in his clothes.

It suggests the blamelessness of a life lived before men and women up to 65, that toothpick, palate and clothes-pressing figure most prominently in the head and front of

gospel according to Fletcher, that most people dig their graves with their teeth. The Commoner was impressed, and, discovering diabetic tendencies about that time, began to diet and consult the scales often. By 60 his weight was down to 202, which represented self-control, for he was a man of a large body, and had a keen zest for food.

That he continued his capacity for intense mental labor beyond threescore, would seem to disprove the report of excess in eating. Personally I never saw any signs of the gourmand in Mr. Bryan beyond what one would associate with a man of his splendid physical condition; nothing beyond that normal degree of appreciation of things to eat that a prideful hostess expects of those who share her hospitality.

The tales of a bunch of onions, or a dozen eggs or an entire beef-steak, consumed at one sitting, probably belong to those misreports of public

his offending; and even these were exaggerated if we believe the testimony of a friend who saw him at the World's Missionary Convention in Edinburgh:

"Mr. Bryan wore a silk hat, a frock coat, striped trousers, patent leather shoes and carried a cane. He was, I thought, the handsomest man of the lot."

I met Judge Alton B. Parker as we were leaving the American church in Paris the first week in August, 1924. The biggest news from home just then was the result of the protracted Democratic National Convention in New York.

"My sympathies are with John W. Davis," said the Judge, "I am afraid Bryan will prove as troublesome to him as he did to me."

The Judge had reason for recalling with discomfiture his disastrous candidacy in 1904, in which he ran a million and a half votes behind the Bryan strength of 1896 and a million and a quarter behind his showing in 1900. Bryan did not bolt the ticket or knife the nominee. He simply damned the outcome of the St. Louis convention with faint praise. He was too straightforward to dissemble.

When he arose to return to the Democratic party the commission placed in his hands eight years before, and renewed four years later, he said the party might dispute whether he had fought a good fight, or whether he had finished his course, but it could not deny that he had kept the faith.

Judge Parker felt that the man who had been the leader of the party for eight years did not keep the faith with him; that the support he yielded was half-hearted at the best. Bryan, he felt, could not forgive his judicial temperament or his geographical disqualifications. He was of the East—the enemy's country.

Then the Commoner closed his convention speech with an appeal from his heart to the hearts of those who heard him, that they give the party a pilot who would guide the Democratic ship away from the Scylla of militarism without wrecking it upon the Charybdis of commercialism. It was a good guess that he had found a new and classic name for a New York possibility. And naturally his enthusiasm was not evoked by the action of Judge Parker in wiring that the party must amend its resolutions before he could consent to become its standard bearer.

In the campaign that followed, the far-reaching modulations of the Bryan voice were heard against militarism, rather than in persuasive appeals for the Parker candidacy. The Commoner attacked the Republican President, candidate for re-election, as the embodiment of the warlike spirit, as the granite and iron that represent modern militarism. So it was a case of one colonel of volunteers assailing another colonel of volunteers, the man-on-horseback figure of the Rough Rider.

"Do you, men of the East, desire to defeat the military idea?" asked Bryan. "Friends of the South, are you anxious to defeat the military idea? Let me assure you that not one of you, north, east or south, fears more than I do the triumph of that idea. If this is the doctrine our nation is to stand for, it is retrogression, not progress. It is the lowering of the ideals of the nation. More than that it is nothing less

than a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world."

Bryan went abroad after the campaign of 1904. In a Fourth of July speech in London he expressed the hope that this nation would lead the way in being allured by Providence to higher ground of international comradeship, winning the confidence of Him who said:

"And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

Unlike many of his countrymen, Mr. Bryan took his teetotalism with him on his travels in foreign lands. He justified his use of water in toasting an admiral in Tokio, when champagne was suggested, by saying:

"You won your victories on water and I drink to your health in water; whenever you win any victories on champagne, I shall drink your health in champagne."

A notable incident of this world tour was the interview between the Christian statesman of the United States and the seer of Russia, Leo Tolstoi, upon the latter's estate at Yasnaya Polyana. The two champions of the common people heartened each other by the interchange of experiences and aspirations.

Bryan's writings and speeches were enriched by these adventures in foreign lands. I saw and heard him soon after his return, and got the thrill of his message on immortality inspired by a few grains of wheat that had slumbered for more than thirty centuries in an Egyptian tomb; and the fine inspiration of his likening the finished human product to the fashioning and finishing process applied by the dexterous Japanese to their exquisite ware:

"There is first the vase, then the tracing of the design upon it, then the filling in of the colors, and, finally, the polishing to bring out the beauty. There is the basic material of body and mind, selection of the ideals that control the life; the filling in of the moral qualities that give tone and color; and finally the polish that comes with education."

With such imagery as this, Mr. Bryan mixed incidents droll and homely, such as the torture and discomfiture imposed upon a democratic visitant in getting him garbed for presentation at court, and acknowledgments to the world-encircling humble hen that provides everywhere a familiar edible to a pilgrim far from home and weary.

When we came together at the World's Press Congress at the Panama-Pacific Exposition, in San Francisco, the conditions in Festival Hall were very trying for an ordinary speaker. It was like holding a recital of chamber music in a boiler shop. Art Smith, the sky-writer, went higher than the speaker's loftiest periods, and neighboring brass bands made themselves heard above the bravest vocal effects.

But with Mr. Bryan's renown, his seemingly effortless bell-tones and his impressive pauses, it was different. A great audience heard him to the end and wanted him to go on, even in the very center of swirling exposition excitement and confusion. It was not a political speech, but he had a good time replying to the taunt of various Republican friends that he was a dreamer while President Roosevelt did things.

He said he did not pay much attention to the title when Senator Beveridge gave it to him until he read shortly afterward that Speaker Cannon called him a dreamer, and then Governor Hanly.

Seeing that he could not expect acquittal with such witnesses against him, he decided to plead guilty and justify.

"I went to the Bible, which tells of dreamers," he continued, "and among the most conspicuous was Joseph. He told his

no undue capitalization of party honors in a fortune that did not at this time comprise much more than the farm in Lincoln and a ranch in Texas, and which never exceeded three-quarters of a million.

His answer always was: "It is clean money. The people know what I gave for it and where I got it."

"I went to the Bible!" That statement in the Panama-Pacific Exposition speech is enlightening as revealing the chief source of the Commoner's inspiration. Charles A. Dana, the veteran editor of the *New York Sun*, held that a young man was equipped for acceptable newspaper writing if he knew three books well—the Bible, Shakespeare and the Constitution of the United States.

Bryan's reading was wider than this, but he did not delve as deeply into history and science and the classics as those whose time is less given to intensity of action. The Book of Books was his inexhaustible mine of treasures; outside of what he drew on his travels, on Nature, on personal experiences, on biography and poetry of the heart—*Gray's Elegy, Lines to a Waterfowl, Cotter's Saturday Night*, and Walter Malone's *Opportunity*—for whatever embellishment he gave to conviction and advocacy.

It is understandable that the great hymns fell more sweetly upon his ear than any other composition; but *La Paloma*, the infectious Mexican air, was a favorite. (To be continued next week)

An Icelandic Tale

THERE is a curious tale in the Bragda Magus Saga, of Iceland, indicating an ancient belief in the prolongation of life.

The story relates how a man once presented himself before Charlemagne, giving his name as Vidforull. Seeing that the stranger was sturdy looking in spite of his wrinkles and his long white hair, the king made some remarks designed to draw a tale from the man, whereupon Vidforull spoke enigmatically, saying that while he was old, he had been older, and might possibly become younger before long. At that the king said courteous things, as became a king, not casting doubt.

"Twice I have cast my skin, sire," answered Vidforull gravely, "and each time was I younger than before. More, this very month I shall slough it again." "At what age do you cast your skin?" asked Charlemagne.

The stranger told the king that the first time he had cast his skin was when he had reached the age of three hundred and thirty years, and, when the happiness of life returned, he found himself as a lusty man of thirty. The second time he had been transformed, he said, was when Hermanric ruled in Rome, and then he had reached the age of two hundred and fifteen years.

Not long after, the king saw Vidforull standing by a great log in the hall, full of merriment, with eyes bright and shining. Vidforull dropped to his knee and said:

"Sire. The time has come. I have long desired to cast off this old skin that has well served me for many a day, and now I know that I shall become young again."

The king wondered a little at his words, but bade his court stand apart and watch in silence. No sooner was a place cleared than Vidforull bared his head, rubbed his skin here and there, then presently rolled it away, and having done so laid himself down at the foot of the post. And those nearest heard Vidforull mutter something,

**Save 1/3 to 1/2
AT FACTORY PRICES**

Ranges \$375 up
Ranges you lowest factory prices. porcelain enamel combination ranges, coal and gas, electric ranges, gas stoves, 200 styles, 2000 colors. Cash or easy terms. 60 days FREE trial. 300 days approval test. 24 hour shipping. 2000000 customers. Make a \$25 to \$75 saving by sending postal for FREE book today.
Kalamazoo Stove Co., Mrs. 540 Rochester Ave., Kalamazoo, Mich.

"A Kalamazoo Direct to You"

PATENTS

Time counts in applying for patents. Don't risk delay in protecting your ideas. Send sketch or model for instructions or write for FREE book, "How to Obtain a Patent" and "Record of Invention" form. No charge for information on how to proceed. Communications strictly confidential. Prompt, careful, efficient service. Clarence A. O'Brien, Registered Patent Attorney 234 Security Bank Building (directly across street from Patent Office), Washington, D. C.

Who Is Governor of Texas?

(Continued from page 4)

the attorney-general came out with a denial that he was "investigating" the highway department, "as reported by a North Texas newspaper"—and the same month that saw the launching of the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram's* investigation in highway affairs.

With these facts at hand it is not too much to assume that Ferguson was "after" Amon Carter. His opportunity to strike back at the publisher came in November. The scene was the football field at College Station and the occasion the Thanksgiving Day game between the State A. & M. College and the University of Texas. Mr. and Mrs. Ferguson were present, and so was Mr. Carter—enthusiastically rooting for the winning team. During the game he was heard to shout, "Hooray for A. & M. and Dan Moody." Moody is the attorney-general. It happened that Carter was standing near the governor's box at the time, although he afterward assured the governor he was unaware of her presence and meant no disrespect.

Mrs. Ferguson wrote a letter to Mr. Carter, which subsequently appeared in the press. It bristled. It alleged that the publisher, when he shouted "Hooray for A. & M. and Dan Moody," was under the influence of a spirituous beverage. It contained broad allusions to a "party" given by Carter some months earlier in Fort Worth, his home city, to a group of visiting oil magnates, whereat canes and other souvenirs with hollowed-out receptacles were handed around, the receptacles containing a pleasant liquid reminder of the occasion. And, on the ground that he had "set a bad example" to the youth of the state, Mrs. Ferguson demanded his resignation from the presidency of a state college board of trustees.

Carter's reply also was handed to the press. He asserted that the oil men's "party" had been shared by a considerable part of the Fort Worth citizenship, including city officials, and that no law of any character had been broken. He denied the governor's charges, bluntly characterized them as a "smoke screen" designed to cover the highway fiasco, and good-humoredly refused to resign from the board.

For two months persistent but not very intelligent efforts have been made in Texas to convene the legislature "for purposes of impeachment." Just whom proponents of the session intended to impeach has not been made entirely clear, but in any case the efforts have come to nothing. Lee Satterwhite, as speaker of the house of representatives, announced in November he would issue a call himself in December in event Governor Ferguson did not, and named



The State of Texas built this colonial mansion in 1854 to be the home of its governors.

her reign was made notable by the solid and constructive things accomplished. Impeach her husband, then? He only "sat in" with the highway commission; he didn't award contracts, he has done nothing. Besides, he is not governor of Texas. He holds no official position whatever.

Then why did Texas elect Mrs. Ferguson?

She herself says it was "Jim's vindication," for what the legislature and courts did to him in 1917; but a majority of Texas voters say it was something else. The mask, not vindication, was the dominating element of the 1924 gubernatorial campaign.

There were nine candidates, and seven to divide the anti-Klan vote. The other two were "bloc" candidates: Judge Felix Robertson, Klansman, and Mrs. Ferguson. With her husband ruled off the ballot she obtained the 150,000 votes which are always his, whenever and for whatever he decides to run—the die-hard Ferguson-farmer-labor-German vote. And a very useful bloc it is. It was enough to nose out Lynch Davidson. Late Mrs. Yett sued Mrs. Nalle for \$939, or one-half the commission on a bond written for a highway contractor; alleging in her petition that Mrs. Nalle had expressed a determination to dissolve the partnership and write bonds singly.

Last June, W. B. Shoe, a \$5,000 per year official of the State Fire Insurance Commission, announced he had been asked

December 15 as the time limit for her call. The Fergusons smiled and said nothing; the zero hour passed unnoticed by them. Then Satterwhite, finding no way satisfactory to himself by which he might call the legislature together, and when pressed by newspaper men, threw up his hands and admitted candidly that he did not know what to do.

Of course there was nothing to do. Impeach Mrs. Ferguson? For what? She has done nothing. She is an honorable woman, an old-fashioned grandmother, and the only legislative session thus far held in

with they took the stump for Mrs. Ferguson. And Texas said no. She was elected by an overwhelming majority and in January, 1925, curreyed in triumph to Austin to reoccupy the venerable colonial mansion on Capitol Hill built by Texas in 1854 for its governors; the same mansion from which the Fergusons had been—to use a Texas colloquialism—bodaciously kicked out, seven years earlier.

Texas pays its governor only \$4,000 a year. No poor man has any right to take the job. Lynch Davidson could afford it (Will Rogers said of him, "Lynch is so rich he can afford to be honest"), but the Fergusons, in their straitened circumstances, could not afford to take it. Mr. Ferguson himself recognized that fact; he said, two weeks before his wife's inauguration, "I am a poor man; in fact, worse than poor. We figure our expense will be increased \$20,000 when we move to the capitol, so there was nothing for me to do but to look around for something to do."

The statement was apropos of his having taken employment as general counsel for W. T. Eldridge at a reported annual salary of \$20,000. Eldridge is a railroad owner and manufacturer of sugar and mattresses. Mr. Ferguson has been out of the law practice for some time. It was not explained precisely what service he had contracted to render to the Eldridge interests. Twenty thousand dollars is a considerable annual retainer, but Ferguson apparently found it insufficient for his needs; other methods to augment the family income were evolved.

For example, Mrs. Ferguson organized herself into the Capitol Syndicate, Inc., employed a competent writer, and sold her observations on life, in serial form, to newspapers.

Then, the governor's husband started out to fix a price for the governor's "interviews," to be paid by correspondents of eastern magazines and newspapers flocking to Austin to "write the Fergusons." However, that practice was soon given up, and interviews with the governor now may be had gratis—if at all.

The governor's daughter, Mrs. Ouida Ferguson Nalle, writes bonds for highway contractors and state officials. The Capitol Insurance Agency was a partnership composed of Mrs. Nalle and Mrs. Ruth Yett. Late Mrs. Yett sued Mrs. Nalle for \$939, or one-half the commission on a bond written for a highway contractor; alleging in her petition that Mrs. Nalle had expressed a determination to dissolve the partnership and write bonds singly.

Last June, W. B. Shoe, a \$5,000 per year official of the State Fire Insurance Commission, announced he had been asked

to resign, because, he said, he had refused to subscribe for Ferguson's weekly newspaper, the *Forum*. This paper has been the ex-governor's liaison with his followers for some years. Soon after Mrs. Ferguson's inauguration it appeared with the advertising of highway contractors, railroads and public utilities: a "Good-Will" section supported by the latter groups, and a "More and Better Roads" section supported by twenty-odd contracting firms.

The *Forum* is proving an excellent source of revenue. The sponsors of the "More and Better Roads" section, for example, contracted to pay each about \$20 weekly, or an aggregate annual sum of about \$20,000. In some instances advertising space was solicited in letters written on the governor's stationery and signed "Jas. E. Ferguson," and in several of these letters were inclosed bidding forms for maintenance of highways, addressed to the Highway Commission.

No one can say how much money Mr. Ferguson has made since his wife became governor. Prior to his election to the governorship in 1914 he was wealthy, but unknown in politics; but the stormy years following, culminating in his impeachment, reduced him to comparative poverty, and since that time he has had hard financial sledding. His close friends say he frankly feels that the State of Texas made him the victim of a ghastly and conscienceless persecution in the course of which it stripped him of all he had, and that now his comeback gives him an ethical and moral right to make all the money he can, so long as he makes it within the law.

Although hostile breakers have beat upon them ceaselessly—the ex-governor has been a candidate for one office or another in every biennial campaign from 1914 on—the Fergusons are far from beaten. Their bitterest enemies do not deny that the tide of the family's fortunes is flowing back strongly after the ebb following the highway fiasco. The grand jury at Austin investigating highway contracts has been a "dud," so far as the criminal phase is concerned. Talk of impeachment has melted into thin nothingness. If the political outlook seems dubious, as it invariably does for the Fergusons three or four months before the primaries, that thought apparently is not worrying Mr. Ferguson—or his wife.

She lately proclaimed January as "Laugh Month" in Texas. "Believing that a cheerful, happy outlook is the best antidote for gloom"—so ran the proclamation, her 1,400th in twelve months. Just now, when the average Texan thinks of events of the past year, in their relation to the political fortunes of the Fergusons, his thought runs somewhat parallel with that expressed in the following editorial comment of the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* on the "Laugh Month" proclamation:

"We can expect the Fergusons to laugh just as long as Texas stands for it; and we can expect the nation to laugh as long as we stand for it. The Fergusons say laugh, so let's do it. The joke is on us."

Who Is Babbitt?

"I am!" says Sinclair Lewis.

NEXT WEEK

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT

Home Crafts for Idle Hands

(Concluded from page 5)

they could not be operated honestly, being basically unsound.

There is the "buy-back" scheme. The home worker purchases materials, or an "outfit," for doing work on the promise that the output will be purchased when satisfactory at a stated price. Rarely is any of the product "satisfactory." Post Office Department inspectors investigating many of these schemes found that products purchased invariably were resold for less than the price paid the few workers thus favored.

Then there is the "teaching-them-how" scheme. A mail course in some kind of quasi-art work is sold, on the promise that after the studies are completed work will be provided the graduates. But few ever get through with the "studies." Usually the lessons consist of nothing more than mimeographed sheets or pamphlets.

Don't imagine that only stupid and badly informed persons "fall" for these schemes. Some are advertised so plausibly and in publications with such high rating for respectability and reliability that many persons of good intelligence are caught by the fascinating bait held out.

As the quack medical advertiser largely blazed the way for the legitimate display advertising, it may be that these fakers will contribute to the development of the field

for home crafts in the United States. The success—for themselves—of these fraudulent operators is excellent evidence of the opportunities awaiting legitimate promoters. From all that the writer can learn, legitimate commercial promoters of home crafts are comparatively few in number and their spheres of operation limited. Of much larger number are the academic promoters, but these are not so numerous or so energetic as they might be.

Even the Federal Government, which now deals extensively with the life and economics of the home, gives comparatively little attention to true home crafts. The home economics bureau of the Department of Agriculture, strangely enough, has given no attention to the subject, not even to the extent of collecting information. The Vocational Board of Education has given a little attention to it, mainly in connection with the work of rehabilitating persons injured in industry. Little attention is given to it by the Veterans Bureau in rehabilitating soldiers disabled by the war.

The southern branch of the extension service of the Department of Agriculture probably has given most attention to it. The Department's work, however, has had to do chiefly with the utilization of by-products of farms and farmsteads.

There has been some development, through this agency, of rug-weaving and of basketry as home crafts. In a few communities in the South these home industries have become sizeable ones.

Certain colleges, notably some in the mountain districts of the South, aim at the development of home crafts. A branch of Tulane University, in New Orleans, is endeavoring to evolve an American school of embroidery. Aside from what some of the Indians do, there is scarcely in the United States a single native and characteristic home craft, as this one might be.

This country has nothing to resemble the toy industry in Germany or the Roquefort

cheese industry in France, both of which are sustained by home craftsmanship.

In fact home crafts have counted for so little in this country that we haven't even the fragments of a literature of the subject. A search of the Library of Congress yielded virtually nothing of that kind. Persons interested in the promotion of these crafts have had to go abroad for worth-while information. Several persons connected with the extension service of the Department of Agriculture have done this in recent years.

"Knowledge of some of the crafts which used to be carried on in some measure out of necessity has been lost or is possessed only by elderly persons," said one of these

to the writer. "Here and there we find an old man who knows the art of tanning hides or that of tooling leather as these used to be practiced on the farmstead. Frequently, a farm family can make use of these crafts much more profitably than its ancestors, who used them solely because they had to. A farmer often can get for a raw hide only what a leather strap will cost him at the store. By turning it into tooled leather he might make it worth anywhere from fifty to a hundred dollars."

"Scattered throughout the country many kinds of raw materials are now going to waste which might be used in home crafts. For instance, the making of baskets out of the long needles that fall from the pine trees in the South is becoming a profitable home craft for women and children in many communities. The wild honeysuckle vine likewise is being used in making baskets that find a good market among florists.


"Some of the biggest industrial establishments of the country grew from home production. The best known of our pickle concerns originated in the kitchen of its founder's wife.

"But Americans as a rule haven't had the time or patience to develop home crafts in the artistic and standardized way that is common in older countries. Markets often are uncertain because neither production nor standard can be depended on."

"There are great opportunities open to persons who will organize marketing machinery for home craft products and assist in the building up of standardized production. Many things still can be made much better by hand than with machines, and the potential demand for such things is much bigger than the supply, but not the potential supply."

"The advantages to be derived from home crafts are manifold. They are not only economic, such as the utilization of materials that otherwise might be wasted and of the time of persons who do not fit into occupational work in stores, factories or offices, but the esthetic benefit is one of the biggest. Most persons have some of the instincts of the artist—a feeling for self-expression through the mind or hand. As the handicrafts pass out, these instincts are unexpressed by thousands who have not unusual talent, initiative or opportunity. The result is discontent with life."

In the writer's opinion there are in home crafts innumerable possibilities for persons with a little capital and good organizing ability to develop prosperous enterprises.



Unusual shot of the "spill" in the chariot race in the film *Ben Hur*. The forms of fallen horses are discernible through the dust.

Are the Movies Cruel to Animals?

THE following protest has been sent to Will Hays by Mrs. Rosemonde Rae Wright, a deputy sheriff of Los Angeles County, California. It relates to alleged cruelty to animals in making the *Ben Hur* motion picture.

"For several weeks previous to the final shooting of the *Ben Hur* chariot race, I was present on the set and witnessed a number of rehearsals. I inspected the horses immediately after the tryouts and I found a number with lacerated bodies, torn mouths, skinned legs, etc. On Saturday, October 3, the great chariot race was shot, in which forty-eight horses and twelve chariots were used. As a Deputy Sheriff of Los Angeles County, and the Executive Vice-President of the American Animal Defense League, I was present."

"Just before the race, in company with a nationally known newspaper woman, I made a brief inspection of the arena. I found a small, powerful camera, all but the lenses concealed in drapery, between the feet of the colossal statue at the end of the central arena. At that time I had reason to anticipate that the 'accident' would occur directly in range of this camera for the 'close up.' I may say, incidentally, that there was no man behind the camera in the final race owing to the dangerous location, and that it was probably manipulated from the inside of the statue."



Four of the racing horses in *Ben Hur*.

"The first lap was made successfully, but as they came down the final stretch a horse in the lead team stumbled, which

brought down three others with him. This was directly in range of the camera previously referred to, and not more than fifteen feet away. Came the frightened, plunging horses and chariots at terrific speed, no efforts being made through the loud speaker to swerve them to the right and thereby avert the climax that was sure to come. It seemed highly probable that the drivers were obeying orders and that the oncoming teams were directed upon the one that was down, until four chariots and sixteen horses were piled up together in a ghastly spectacle of cruelty. Only a benevolent Providence saved the animals from a horrible death."

"I was in the arena immediately after the 'accident' and saw the trembling, lacerated bodies of the frightened animals extricated from the débris. It was a bloody 'close up' in which the bodies of sentient

animals and their sufferings were of no consideration whatever. I saw

the body of an animal that had been killed the day before in the rehearsal; also the punctured breast, the torn, sensitive mouths and the bruised, bleeding bodies of others in the final race; also animals injured badly enough to be sent to the hospital."

Bearing on the same subject is the following affidavit:

"Emerson Hough stated that because he very much objected to the maiming and killing of animals during the filming of a picture, he was refused admittance to the lot.—Ellis Soper."

You Pick Them: I Can't By EARL REEVES

THE cartoonists and dramatists and movie directors must be having a terrible time. They need to tell us what a character is at a single glance, so that the business of discovering identities does not slow up their stories.

But where are the types?

Once you could put a straw in the corner of a half-open mouth, or some fodder on the chin, and you had a farmer. Or dandruff on the collar introduced you to a writer; long hair was the hieroglyph for artists; and a cold, hard eye meant a banker who lurked in a back room and foreclosed mortgages on widows and orphans.

But I defy you to identify our milkman. He owns a farm, but he looks like a retired banker—one who left his gimlet eye behind when he left the bank for good. And as for my banker, he has the kindly eye of a family physician. Moreover, he sits out in front and his motto is "service." The other day I went to see an eminent statistician; and instead of a horn-rim-glassed owl of a man I found a shock of unruly hair, a brilliant smile and the eyes of an adventurer. Precisely that. The last college professor I talked to looked like a prosperous bond salesman; while the absent-minded, studious looking fellow I set down as a scholar proved to be the editor of our local newspaper, and a right brisk sheet it is too.

Casting memory back over some of the noted men I have met I discover that the world's most famous editor—a cabinet maker—looked a good deal like a country squire; his successor in editorial-Warwicking has the broad mouth and smile of a preacher; the leader in the he-man business of building skyscrapers is mildness itself; a certain great detective might be mistaken for a butcher; one of the speedy business world's leading supermen appears to be a clubman and has time for all the verbal amenities of life; a great mercantile organizer looks much like a barber; a very eminent inventor has something of the air of a judge; the most spectacular "journalist" of our generation looks more like a certain jazz king every day, while the jazz king looks less and less like a musician.

And as for millionaires. They seem to be, taken in the lump, a good deal like newspapermen. And newspapermen are not the eager and alert crew of stage and fiction: taken as a class they look a good deal like—well, like straphangers.

While the ladies—if a Parisian beauty who is no better than she should be dons a new creation in Rue de la Paix this afternoon and motors out through the Bois to the races to give the world a treat, the cables will describe the dress tonight, tomorrow it will be reproduced in New York, next week you will be able to buy a copy in Kokomo; and the week after that, Ma Perkins, who lives three miles north of Whynot, Nebraska, will be ordering the same thing from a mail order catalog.

You pick 'em: I can't.

For grandmothers look like flappers; sweet young things look like painted ladies; and I defy you to look over a bevy of femininity and say with accuracy that this and that and the other one are parents. My wife said I was wrong as usual; the peach we passed today was Boy's school-teacher, while the faded, timid thing was that demon of strong will, a trained nurse.

A Dance a Week



Some Further Instruction on the Correct Movements in a Plain Quadrille



Last week we gave a description of movements which ordinarily find place in a plain quadrille. A quadrille is usually made up of four figures, and what was given last week may be regarded as Figure 1 of a quadrille. Printed in ordinary description it would run thus:

Address partners, then corners	
First four right and left	8 bars
Balance four	8 bars
Ladies chain	8 bars
Half promenade	4 bars
Half right and left to place	4 bars
All join hands forward and back	4 bars
Turn partners	4 bars

The best method of turning partners is illustrated in Figure 1.



FIGURE 1.


Turn partners..... 4 bars

All join hands with partners, arms extended, waist high, and walk around, one complete turn.

Couples on the side, repeat all movements.

The second part of the quadrille now follows:

WAIT FIRST EIGHT MEASURES



First two forward, swing in center..... 8 bars

Figure 2 above shows the starting of the movement.

The picture below, swing in the center.




FIGURE 3.

Figure 3 shows first two about to swing in center.



FIGURE 4.

Figure 4—Ladies grand chain.

Four ladies grand chain..... 8 bars

Four ladies cross right hands, walk half around, drop right hands, give left hand to opposite gentleman, turn one-half around. Each lady then returns to her own place by giving her right hand to the opposite lady, then left hand to partner and turn in place.

The next two forward, swing in center..... 8 bars

The head gentleman and opposite lady turn in center.

Four gentlemen grand chain..... 8 bars

Same as for ladies, the gentlemen giving right hands across.

The next two forward, swing in center..... 8 bars

The next two on the side, farthest from the head couple.

Ladies grand chain..... 8 bars

The last two forward, turn in center..... 8 bars

Allemande left..... 8 bars

All promenade..... 8 bars

All cross hands with own partner, and promenade around the outside of the set. See Figure 5.



FIGURE 5.

Still another part of the quadrille may be danced as follows:

WAIT FIRST EIGHT MEASURES

Eight hands around as in Figure 6 8 bars




FIGURE 6.

All join hands, and circle to the left. One complete turn.

Four ladies cross right hands, balance in line 8 bars

All promenade as in Figure 7 8 bars




FIGURE 7.

Cross hands with partner, and promenade in a circle.

Allemande left as in Figure 8 8 bars



FIGURE 8.

Each dancer turns back to back with own partner, walks four steps to the corner; meets new partner; they turn each other with right hand. Return four steps to place, and turn own partner with the left hand.

Grand right and left as in Figure 9 16 bars



FIGURE 9.

Face partners, salute, then join right hands, gentlemen moving to the right, ladies to the left, passing in opposite directions. Gentleman then drops partner's right hand, and takes next lady's left in his left; next lady's right in his right, and so on, alternating left and right hand in order. When half around, he meets and salutes his partner, gives her his right hand and continues to place. Note: this is a weaving in and out movement, passing to the right of one, to the left of the next, until the complete circle is made.

All balance corners, turn partners as in Figure 10 8 bars




FIGURE 10.

Face corner lady, step to side with right foot, point toe of left foot in front, step to side with left foot, point toe of right foot in front. Turn and face own partner, join hands, waist high, and turn once around.

All promenade to seats 8 bars

Couples will cross hands with own partner, chasse a few steps, then link arms with partner and promenade the remaining distance to seats.

How the Coolidge Cabinet Functions

(Continued from page 8)

sent. One of the great tasks of a President is to keep harmony in his Cabinet. Lincoln was peculiar in this respect. While the memoirs of the different members of his Cabinet reveal constant friction and often bitter feeling, none of the members quarreled with the President. Gideon Welles, Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy, in his diary, constantly railed about the evil influences of Seward and Stanton upon the President. Not in a single line does he question the high purpose and sincerity of Lincoln. The same is true of the other members of Lincoln's Cabinet in their accounts of the inside workings of the Administration. They all loved Lincoln, but hated each other.

Almost the reverse is true of the Johnson Administration. The outstanding quarrel which Johnson had with the members of his Cabinet, of course, was the differences he had with his Secretary of War. His removal of Stanton from head of the War Department led to Johnson's impeachment. At least this was the incident which was made an issue by Congress in the impeachment proceedings. However, the other members of Johnson's Cabinet did not have the respect for the President that the office deserved, which brought disaster upon him.

Second only to the troubles in Johnson's Cabinet were those in the Wilson official family. Had he been so disposed, Woodrow Wilson could scarcely have refused to appoint William Jennings Bryan as Secretary of State. The country recognized that it was the fight Bryan made against Tammany Hall in the Baltimore Convention that nominated Wilson. Yet Bryan was temperamentally unfit to head Wilson's State Department. More than once President Wilson took personal charge of matters in the State Department. This resulted in the estrangement of his former champion in the Baltimore Convention.

No man, with the possible exception of Roosevelt, had a larger personal following than Bryan. From the time that he made the "Crown of Thorns and Cross of Gold" speech in the 1896 convention there was a large body of earnest people who followed him unfalteringly to his grave. His withdrawal from the Cabinet alienated from the Wilson Administration this faction of the Democratic party.

Colonel House Irritated Colonel House was a constant source of irritation to the Wilson Cabinet. The

President handled matters through him which members of the Cabinet thought should come through regular channels. In his letters, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior in the Wilson Cabinet, revealed that there were very heated discussions in the Cabinet when the country was on the verge of going into war. In one of his letters he said:

"This led to the discussion of the great problem which we were all afraid to raise—why should we send out our ships without guns or convoys. Daniels said: 'We must not convoy—that would be dangerous.' The President said: 'That the country was not willing that we should take any risk of war.' I said that I got no such sentiment out of the country, but if the country knew that our consuls had been treated so outrageously that there would be no question as to the sentiment. This the President took

as suggesting that we should work up propaganda of hatred against Germany. Of course, I said I had no such idea, but that I felt that in a democracy the people were entitled to know the facts. McAdoo, Houston, and Redfield joined me. The President turned on them bitterly, especially on McAdoo, and reproached all of us with appealing to the spirit of the Codequello. We couldn't get the idea out of his head that we were bent on pushing the country into war. Houston talked of resigning after the meeting. McAdoo will—within a year, I believe.

When Lansing Quarreled With Wilson "I do not know whether the President is an internationalist or a pacifist, he seems to be mildly national—his patriotism is covered over with a film of philosophic humanitarianism that certainly doesn't make for 'punch' at such time as this."

This from Mr. Lane's letters should not be taken to indicate that he was unfriendly to the President. His letters were filled with the most fulsome praise of Woodrow Wilson.

When Wilson went to Europe to attend the Versailles Conference he was entirely out of touch with his Cabinet. During his absence Vice-President Marshall held meetings, but this was only to keep up appearances. When the President returned from Europe in July, 1919, he held a number of meetings of the Cabinet before he left on his western trip, but he did not get a grip on the affairs of his Administration. From that time until March 4, 1921, when his Administration came to a close, on account of his illness, the President did not attend a meeting of his Cabinet. Shortly after Christmas in 1920 Secretary Lansing incurred the displeasure of Woodrow Wilson by calling a Cabinet meeting. This was unprecedented and resulted in Mr. Lansing's estrangement from Mr. Wilson and his retirement from the Cabinet. During this long period of the President's illness, Admiral Grayson, Secretary Tumulty, and Barney Baruch were credited with being the real Cabinet. It was through this trio that the President was reached on all official business until the close of his Administration.

With the election of Harding the Cabinet once more assumed its normal functions. President Harding prided himself on conferring "with the best minds," and in his opinion there were none better than the members of his Cabinet. He established a precedent by calling the Vice-President into Cabinet meetings. Calvin Coolidge, then Vice-President, attended the meetings and was frequently called on for advice. The President emphasized the importance of this and insisted that it was not a mere form or compliment, but that he wanted the Vice-President to come into the official family. The press dwelt much on the fact that Harding had given the Vice-President something to do aside from presiding over the deliberations of the Senate. It was assumed that Harding had inaugurated a new policy which would be followed by his successor, but up to this writing Vice-President Dawes has not been asked to attend a meeting of the Coolidge Cabinet.

There were no serious differences in the Harding Cabinet. It was a happy official family as long as he lived. The oil investi-

gations—which resulted in the retirement of Secretary Fall and Secretary Denby, two members of the Harding Cabinet who were retained by his successor—did not disturb the affairs of the Coolidge Administration. Even the resignation of Attorney-General Daugherty, after the sensational investigation of the Department of Justice, did not create a rift in the Coolidge Cabinet. Coolidge has been remarkably successful in handling his Cabinet under the most trying conditions—which accounts in a great measure for his reelection.

With the approach of the next Republican convention the question naturally arises as to whether any serious differences will develop in the Coolidge Cabinet. There is a very active group of Hoover partisans who are attempting to impress the country with the idea that the Secretary of Commerce is the overshadowing figure of the Cabinet. Under the plan for the reorganization of the Departments of the Government the functions of the Department of Commerce are to be enlarged. This will give Secretary Hoover increased authority and make him more prominent in the country. Observers around Washington are of the opinion that a foundation for a presidential boom for Hoover is being laid.

How far this will go before it creates dissensions in the Coolidge Cabinet is a matter of much speculation around Washington. The question is being asked as to whether this is being done with the approval of President Coolidge. There is a theory that perhaps after all Calvin Coolidge will not be a candidate to succeed himself but is willing to have his mantle fall on the shoulders of Herbert Hoover.

The Cabinet really holds executive sessions. The newspapers usually carry longer accounts of executive sessions of the Senate than they do of the open sessions. It is assumed that unless the President indicates that he wishes something said about the Cabinet meeting, all of the conversation and the proceedings will be confidential. In one way or another Cabinet proceedings occasionally seep out to the press. But the memoirs of the members of the Cabinet which have been published from time to time show plainly that there is very little of the real discussions that take place made public at the time. When the President announces his decisions on important matters he rarely indicates in any manner whether he has the approval of his Cabinet. It is always assumed that he has unless some member makes a protest by resigning.

Lincoln Did Not Worry About Cabinet Attendance Unless the President advises them otherwise the ten members of the Cabinet are expected to be in their places in the Cabinet Room of the Executive Office at 10:30 a.m. on every Tuesday and Friday. This, of course, is when the President is in Washington. When a member of the Cabinet, on account of illness or some other reason, cannot attend the regular meetings he must notify the White House or send his assistant. The matter of sending his assistant is a matter for the Secretary to decide.

President Lincoln, Gideon Welles' diary indicates, was probably the only Chief Executive who was not concerned with the attendance of the

members of his Cabinet. He never commented upon their absence while Presidents, both before and since then, have not tolerated neglect on the part of members to attend regular meetings. Under the precedents and usages from the foundation of the Government, the Secretary of State occupies a seat on the right of the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury on the left. The Secretary of War comes next, and the other members of the Cabinet in the order that their departments were created by Congress. The Department of Labor was the last created and therefore the Secretary of Labor is at one end of the table and the President at the other.

Promptly at 10:30 the President enters. This was a very formal and ceremonious affair until President Harding established another precedent. When he entered the Cabinet Room he began by shaking hands with the Secretary of State and passed around until he had greeted every member. He frequently interspersed his greetings with inquiries concerning their health and their families and other personal matters. President Coolidge has followed this precedent and no doubt it will be continued as long as the President and members are on speaking terms. This would have been a very painful function for President Johnson during the stormy days of his Administration. There are no clerks, messengers, or any one except the members of the Cabinet in the room during these regular sessions. No record is kept of anything that is said.

If the President has any matter involving the policies of his Administration upon which he desires to seek advice he announces it sometimes in an informal manner and other times by reading a part of his message to Congress or speech which he intends to deliver. In making comments or suggestions the Secretary of State is expected to speak first. If he has nothing to suggest or no comment to make he indicates either in words or by the nod of his head. The others

follow in the order in which they are seated, the Secretary of Labor being the last to speak. If the President has nothing to lay before the Cabinet he calls for suggestions or reports from the members beginning with the Secretary of State and continuing until he reaches the Secretary of Labor.

A member of the Cabinet who is expecting to take any action which would affect another department, or two or more departments, is supposed to bring the subject up at a meeting of the Cabinet. Frequently, also, a member at a previous meeting has been instructed by the President to investigate some subject and report to the Cabinet. Business is not transacted under heads like in lodges and societies, but the whole proceedings are informal. The President it is assumed will direct the line along which he proposes discussions shall be conducted.

There are times in every Administration when the President is under the impression that a member of the Cabinet is planning to bring up a subject at a meeting which is loaded with high explosives. He may fear that its consideration at that particular time will create friction and might lead to resignations. It is just such situations that require careful handling to avoid embarrassing developments in the councils of the President's advisers, which might not only affect the Cabinet, but extend to the party and Congress.

With this thought in mind Presidents have been known quietly to guide the discussions into what appears to be unimportant channels and waste the entire session while some member may be anxious to bring up what he thinks is of the utmost importance. Often this becomes apparent to other members who follow the lead of the President and discuss trivial matters.

At the close of each session it is the invariable custom for the President to announce that if any member has matters to bring up which are not of general interest to the Cabinet he will be pleased to see him

in his office. The same order of precedence is observed by the Cabinet in calling at the President's office after the adjournment. The Secretary of State goes in first and if he is the aggrieved party who wanted to bring up some objectionable matter the President then has an opportunity to make plain his objections to the consideration of the subject in open Cabinet meeting at that time. In like manner the President will have an opportunity for a confidential talk with other members of his official family which may be of the highest importance after the close of the regular Cabinet meeting.

The thousands of letters that pour in daily upon the White House are referred to the members of the Cabinet. More and more each year the people, not only of the United States, but in far-off Alaska, Porto Rico, Panama, the Philippines, and Guam, are calling on the President to regulate their affairs. Recently there have been appeals to President Coolidge to lighten the burden of city, county and state taxation. By the White House correspondence one might reach the conclusion that a majority of the people have forgotten that they have any state or local officials. Representative Gallivan, of Massachusetts, provoked even the dry members of Congress to laughter by suggesting that President Coolidge should arm himself with an automatic pistol and go out and enforce Prohibition. Mr. Gallivan must have been reading some of the letters which have been received recently at the White House.

The handling of the President's correspondence is, however, a serious problem, and is treated seriously by the President and Cabinet members. Work of classifying the letters is started systematically by a force of clerks. The crank letters are eliminated. There are cranks who have written weekly letters to the President for years; some of them are still writing to Roosevelt.

Letters which apparently come from thoughtful and well-informed men and women are referred to the proper member of the Cabinet for investigation and suggestions. Form letters are stopped at their source. If a small group who are pouring thousands of letters into the White House think they are deceiving anyone it is suggested that they revise their opinions. During the last session of Congress, Secretary of War Weeks discovered that about twenty-five per cent of form letters being sent in by a pacific group bore no addresses and the signatures were strikingly similar. Evidently the men who were hired to sign these letters by using names from the telephone directory had done a very bunglesome job.

Of course, everyone connected with the Administration, from the President down, desires to keep in touch with the drift of public sentiment, but in order to do this they must carefully analyze the White House correspondence. It is recognized that these letters, as well as the press, are the barometer of sentiment in the country. The problem is to read the barometer correctly.

This subject is frequently brought up at Cabinet meetings. A secretary to whom a certain class of letters has been referred makes his report on them. Other members of the Cabinet comment freely on the subject with a view to giving the letters the acid test.

Thus through his Cabinet—his Council of Advisers—his general staff, the President is not only endeavoring to administer the ever-increasing complications of the government but to determine what the people think of the job.

A sunny smile in Sweden. This young miss from Leksand (Dalecarlia) is cordial to the camera.



Gay raiment. Very serious in all his finery is this Hungarian boy, but his sister seems to have the saving grace of a sense of humor.



School days in Kashmir (in circle). Education for this lad consists largely in the ability to read the Koran and to write passages in Arabic.

Tiny Italian Maud Muller "on a summer's day..." Busily engaged in raking hay, and glad to have almost any one pass that way.

Bound for church. And it is hard to tell which member of this little Dutch family is most intent on getting there on time.



With Children— Around the World

The Mount of the Holy Cross



The Mount of the Holy Cross is a celebrated peak of the Rocky Mountains, situated in Eagle County, Colorado, about 75 miles southwest of Denver. It derives its name from two snow-filled ravines which cross each other at right angles and present from a distance the appearance of a white cross.

THE sinew and heart of man seems to be drawn out, and we are become timorous, desponding whimperers. We are afraid of truth, afraid of fortune, afraid of death, afraid of each other. We are parlor soldiers. The rugged battle of fate, where strength is won, we shun. If our young men miscarry in their first enterprises they lose all heart. A sturdy lad from New Hampshire, or Vermont, who in turn tries all the professions, who teams it, farms it, peddles, keeps a school, preaches, edits a newspaper, goes to Congress, buys a township and so forth, in successive years, and always like a cat falls on his feet, is worth a hundred of these city dolls.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson.